

Right Now!

Issue 36


July – September 2002

£1.50

A magazine of politics, ideas and culture

USA: \$4.00

Australia: \$6.00



Quotas in the balance –

Ezra Mishan on whether proportionality equals justice

Libertarians, populists and social change

– The struggle for the soul of the Conservative Party

**Roderick Moore on winning the culture war ♦ The SWP – apologists for evil?
Home truths on hunting ♦ Black-on-black racism ♦ Taki on the youth of today**

PO Box 2085,
London, W1A 5SX, UK.

Tel/fax: (0845) 601 3243

E-mail: rightnow@compuserve.com

Website: www.right-now.org

Patrons:

The Rt. Hon. Viscount Massereene
and Ferrard

The Rt. Hon. Lord Deramore
Brian Crozier

Professor Antony Flew

Professor Paul Gottfried

Professor David Marsland

Professor Ezra Mishan

Professor Thomas Molnar

Professor Dwight D Murphy

Peter D Robinson, MP

Fr. James Thornton

Publisher:

Taki Theodoracopulos

Editor: Derek Turner

Contributing Editors:

Roger Alsop

Christopher Luke

Marco Respinti (Milan)

Allan Robertson

G V Shugg

Cover: Stewart Buchan

CONTENTS

Editorial	2
A moment of history	
– Stuart Millson	3
Libertarians, populists and	
social change – David Worsley	4
The proportionality thesis	
– Ezra Mishan	6
A real Pillar of Hercules	
– Michael Brufal de Melgarejo ..	8
Illegal immigration – who	
benefits? – Hal Colbatch	10
Overlooked Britain	11
Does sex education actually	
work? – Ray Honeyford	12
'Get out' movements of Africa	
– Giuseppe de Santis	13
Inbox	14
Home truths about hunting	
– Richard Vesterbusch	15
Griffiths	15
On view: <i>Dark Blue World</i>	16
Toby Belcher	16
Changing the cultural environ-	
ment – Roderick Moore	18
PC CBBC – Tim Bragg	19
Books	20
The SWP: eccentric apologists	
for evil – Andrew Cassidy	23
John Bull	24
Letters	26
Right around the world	27
Taki	28

© Copyright 2002 *Right Now!*

Opinions expressed in by-lined articles
are the authors' own, and should not
be taken to represent the editorial
viewpoint of *Right Now!*

Printed, published and distributed by
Right Now Press Limited, PO Box
2085, London, W1A 5SX.

Right Now! complies with the Data
Protection Act, 1998. Records may be
held on and processed by a computer
database.

The centre cannot hold

For the first time, parties of the populist Right are starting to make major electoral breakthroughs in many European countries. Although these breakthroughs are sometimes short-lived, and followed by decelerations or reverses, the very fact that such parties can be runners-up in the elections for the French presidency, be in European governing coalitions or become the largest party in major European cities has profound implications for all Europeans.

Although the parties concerned are very different in outlook and style, they all owe their success to a widespread belief that the public's views on a whole range of important matters (most notably, crime and immigration) are being ignored. And this belief is entirely correct. Topics like crime and immigration are so important, and so emotive, that mainstream politicians would much rather not talk about them at all – or they confine themselves to vapid soundbites. Now the proverbial elephant in the drawing room is trumpeting for attention – yet still nothing is being done. Is it so surprising that voters are staying away from the polls, or voting for anti-establishment parties? (And these days, it is *only* the populist Right that is genuinely radical, or anti-establishment.)

Populist parties of the Right are the only ones who are asking awkward questions, or hinting that perhaps things might not magically work out for the best, after all – as appears to be the less than perfectly thought through long term plan of the Left. With their assumption of this sceptical, Cassandra role, populist Rightists have donned the former conservative mantle – which, for the most part, the rump 'conservative' parties of the West have abandoned. Populist Rightwingers may not always come up with the right answers, but at least they are asking the right questions.

For this tedious, laborious and sometimes dangerous job, they deserve better than the treatment that is usually meted out to them by reporters and politicians. To call them 'extremists' is usually the first, and often the only, reaction. While vested interests will naturally strive to protect their privileges, and abuse language to rationalise their hold on power, this seems more than usually unjust.

What could possibly be 'extremist' about seeking to preserve social stability, and Western civilisation? Parties like France's Front National, the Flemish Vlaams Blok, Holland's List Pim Fortuyn or

Austria's Freedom Party are arguably far less 'extreme' than, say, Sinn Féin, with its many links to murderers, or European communist parties, with their historical links to the mass-murdering Soviet Union. 'Extremist' can really only justifiably be used to describe political methods, rather than beliefs – all of which, to deconstructionists and liberals, are surely equally 'valid', worthy of polite reception and reasoned argument. (But, as we know, Leftists only believe in free speech when they agree with what the speaker is saying.)

If it be thought acceptable to use 'extremist' to denote political beliefs, then shouldn't the Left – with its hostility to the historically-favoured human systems of family, tradition, the nation-state – be called 'extreme'? Those who want to dispose of the Royal Family or absorb Britain into the European empire are in reality far more 'extreme' than their opponents. Those who say they believe in improving society and in freedom of expression should in fact thank those who discuss topics that everyone else wants to ignore.

Here, the Labour Party has been subtler than most of its European counterparts in responding to the rise of the populist Right – even if, so far, Labour's response has been more rhetorical than real. Yet that rhetoric is forceful – as Boris Johnson asked in a recent article "What is the difference between Blunkett and Le Pen?" – and signifies that at least a few people within the government recognise a looming disaster when they see it.

But our present government will inevitably fail to come up with real solutions, because even its most intelligent members do not really comprehend the nature or magnitude of our social problems and they are, besides, more interested in retaining office than assuming responsibility.

Meanwhile, the Conservatives are engaging in rhetoric of their own – but, as is the Rightwing wont, it is derivative, unconvincing and about 20 years out of date, more likely to antagonise existing supporters than to attract new ones. Parties that take the ideological lead always prevail electorally, a lesson Lady Thatcher should have taught today's frightened, directionless Tories.

The nice, clean, safe world that Westerners made for themselves is breaking asunder, and no-one in authority seems to want to know. They should not be surprised if – or should that be when? – the game is finally wrenched out of their fumbling hands. □

A moment of history....

Stuart Millson says that republicanism is only skin deep

It has been observed (even by the BBC) that the passing of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother has left a great void in the nation's life. It is certainly difficult to think of anyone who embodied the grace of the old England, the spirit of Britain, more majestically than the last Empress. For the generation who lived through the trials of the war years, her presence in the blitzed East End of London inspired and galvanised the people. For the younger generation – a generation which has been told that the past doesn't matter – she was a vital link with older values, and a symbol of the continuity and family unity which all human beings crave.

Now, we mourn her – and it does seem that we have lost someone of legendary status. Yet it may well be that the 'void' of which the BBC spoke is not some vast, irreparable wound, but the exact reverse. Could it be that the impression she made and the public mourning and celebration she inspired have had the effect of thoroughly reinvigorating the loyalty and royalism of the British people? Could it be that her spirit in death has provided us with a new lease of life? As a *Daily Telegraph* headline put it on the day after her funeral: "How these 10 days turned the tide".

As many other commentators and columnists have said, the Queen Mother's funeral service and the extraordinary pageantry and emotion which flowed from it have reaffirmed beyond all doubt the innately royalist nature of the British people. Those who were sneering and smugly predicting the 'end of an era', the 'beginning of the end for the monarchy' now seem completely isolated and in the tiny minority – and rightly so. Yet what this remarkable tide of traditionalism and small-c conservatism also demonstrates is how gloriously unchanged and unchanging the nation really is.

There is a tendency by the patriotic side – our side – to think that the 'clever, clever' fashionable, republican element which has monopolised the media really does represent the new thinking in Britain. Happily, we now know this to be quite untrue – that the official cynics and smirkers represent no-one but themselves. For out there in a thousand ordinary streets, towns, villages and council estates the people have just been getting on with their own lives, thinking their own thoughts, and have very possibly been almost untouched by the chattering, speculation, self-importance and propaganda from the Britain-hating cliques in the media and political classes.

Schoolchildren living in areas dominated by politically correct education authorities and forced nothing but anti-monarchism,

responded with thousands of poems, pictures and messages in memory of the Queen Mother. And the BBC which wants us to be 'modern', 'progressive' and 'internationalist' – its own words – was taken aback by the sheer tidal wave of traditionalism engulfing the nation. The broadcasters seemed often irritated or bewildered by the crowds along the Mall, the Thames and Parliament Square, and for once it is these individuals – the liberal elites – who have found themselves alienated and cautious. It certainly struck me how uneasy the Blairs looked, and how out of their element they seemed, as the dignitaries entered Westminster Abbey – notwithstanding their efforts to muscle in on the event.

For those of us who were there in this defining moment of our nation's history – and I was one of the tens of thousands who lined the Queen Mother's way on the Friday before the lying in state – the ceremony,

Queen Elizabeth visits patients in Hatfield House, a military hospital, during World War II



spirit, goodness and brotherhood of those hours will never be forgotten. Next to me, for example, was a thoroughly mixed bag of humanity: students from Egypt and Germany, visitors from the United States, and families from Surrey, the north of England, from all points of the compass. This was an occasion for national unity and a curious sort of Anglophile internationalism which few could have predicted.

There were very many, very young people there, too, and young people who had come of their own accord. Although the majority were 'Anglo-Saxons' (*The Guardian* and *Independent* always love to point out how white such events are), I noticed several people from other races who seemed just as transfixed by the spectacle as the native-born Britons. Indeed, on one later BBC news report, a young man from an African country spoke of his admiration for England and the monarchy – "I will tell you my friend", he said to the interviewer, "the Queen Mother is loved all over this

world..." Naturally, the man with the microphone could not possibly comment...

I soon realised that, despite my difference in ancestry and culture, this man from Africa was closer to me, spiritually and emotionally, than any middle-class white liberal. Could it be that the much-maligned 'racist' Right is actually fighting for all true, decent authentic peoples and cultures, and the noble impulses of national community and respect for the past which form the bedrock of all civilised life? Could it be that these events will make people see more clearly than ever before just what we as a nation might lose if the liberal-left is allowed to play fast and loose with our future?

Sadly, I doubt whether any of these tides of royalism will boost the fortunes of the official "Conservative and Unionist Party". Apart from wearing the correct formal dress, Iain Duncan Smith and his followers have played no part in the propaganda battle for the monarchy which has been raging and which has now been won. The credit for opposing the republican broadcasting media goes, not to HM Opposition, but to the Simon Heffers, Melanie Phillips, *The Daily Mails* and the Charles Moores of this world

– writers and publications who now constitute the real opposition in Britain. Given that Duncan Smith has committed his party to a pale-pink 'let's be modern' agenda, just why should the reborn conservative spirit drift toward his party?

The situation is now clear: two Britains have suddenly emerged in sharp relief and it falls to us to galvanise *our* side. On the one hand, we have the enemy – the self-appointed liberal élite, the political class, the angry 'teachers', the nauseating 'local education authorities' which ban English history, the British Broadcasting Corporation – once a force for identity and civilisation, but now a playground and employment service for the Left. On the other hand we have... *us*, the mass of the people of these islands, who just want a quiet life, a secure future – our Crown, currency, culture and Kingdom intact and unassailable. And with Kipling's "uncounted folk" with us, behind us, and part of us, we cannot fail. □

Stuart Millson writes from Kent

Libertarians, populists and social change

David Worsley says that the new Tory approach is not conservative – and won't help them win elections

Since the Conservative Party's second catastrophic general election defeat, many analyses have appeared in print purporting to explain the causes of the Tories' unpopularity. Most have suggested that the party as a whole is too 'extreme' to be elected, but none of these have been backed up with statistics demonstrating that Conservative policies were unpopular in the way that Labour's were in 1983. Other theorists note that the electorate seldom vote for divided parties, and thus focus on the ongoing split regarding the single European currency. However, the emphasis on this issue has meant that less attention has been paid to another, perhaps more important division within the Tory ranks, namely that between 'libertarians' and 'populists'.

Shortly before the 1997 general election, the Institute of Economic Affairs commissioned MORI to undertake some public opinion research that would enable the electorate to be classified into five groups according to their attitudes on a number of political issues. The authors concluded that 36% of the British electorate were 'natural' conservatives, who generally believed in the free market, whilst supporting strong state intervention on non-economic issues in order to uphold established moral norms.¹ These small-c conservatives were by far the largest of the categories that the authors had defined, and the Conservative Party was doing a reasonable job of appealing to these voters. However, it was clear that in order to win a general election, the Tories would have to appeal to other groups, principally 'libertarians' who are enthusiastic about capitalism but not about traditional morality, and 'authoritarians' who are sceptical about the free market but support intervention in the social and personal sphere.²

In the past, the Conservative Party has successfully done this by accommodating both libertarian and traditionalist elements within its own ranks, with the leadership taking care to reconcile the two factions. Margaret Thatcher often used the rhetoric of liberty when advocating economic reform, but she also expressed anxiety about Britain being "swamped" by mass immigration, pushed a strong line on law and order, and criticised the social effects of the 'permissive society' legislation that she had cautiously supported in the 1960s.³ She was thus able to simultaneously pose as a champion of freedom, and a defender of social order and morals. However, in recent years, over-shadowed by the intractable debate about the European Union, but noticeable nonetheless, there have been signs that the libertarian Right is now more interested in attacking the populist

and traditionalist Right than in fighting the Left. The calls by those who have surrounded Michael Portillo to 'modernise' the party are a symptom of this trend.

According to *Times* journalist Tim Hames, a supporter of Portillo, the Conservative Party can no longer successfully embrace libertarians (whom he refers to simply as liberals) alongside traditionalists and populists. Shortly after the 2001 general election he wrote: "Conservatives have invested an enormous amount of energy in the fiction that either these two incompatible outlooks differ merely on means rather than ends or that it is the purpose of the Conservative party to reconcile them ... Traditional conservatism is hostile to change, reverential of the past, and intensely fatalistic about the future. Liberalism, on the other hand, assumes that change is the natural dynamic of society, has a polite but largely disinterested relationship with the past and is essentially optimistic about the future. A conservative would approach the present dilemma of the Right – namely a Left which has finally embraced market democracy – by largely abandoning the traditional economic terrain and adopting cultural politics or traditional values as the next political battleground ... That means the Conservative party needs to put conservatism to one side and become a more consistent force for all aspects of liberalism".⁴

FORTHCOMING DIVORCE?

To some extent, the marriage between libertarians and populists within the Conservative Party was always merely an alliance of convenience in the face of the twin threats of socialism at home and communism abroad. The removal of these threats during the 1980s has negated this source of cohesion between the various strands of the Right. Nevertheless, there are other reasons, apart from their differing values, which contribute to some libertarians' desire to ditch the populists.

At present, the most important distinction between the libertarian and populist Right is their differing attitudes to social change, and in particular the breakdown of traditional moral values and national identity since the 1960s, and the possibility of these trends continuing into the foreseeable future. Presently, the *zeitgeist* appears favourable to the idea that all social change is intrinsically beneficial, and that the destruction of old moralities and identities is merely part of a transition to an uninhibited and individualistic utopia. Such ideas have always formed a part of the liberal notion of progress, but the view

seems to have been radically reborn in the 1950s and 1960s. Led by the German philosopher Herbert Marcuse, the Frankfurt School turned Marx's social theory upside-down, by suggesting that rather than being the product of capitalism, traditional morality and national identity were the props upon which the oppressive bourgeois order rested. Mounting a direct attack upon the family or patriotism could thus be a means of attacking capitalism itself.

The Leftwing social historian Arthur Marwick has called this the Great Marxian Fallacy, which he summarises as "the belief that the society we inhabit is the bad bourgeois society, but that, fortunately, this society is in a state of crisis, so that the good society which lies just around the corner can be easily attained if only we work systematically to destroy the language, the values, the culture, the ideology of bourgeois society ... Practically all the activists, student protesters, hippies, yuppies, Situationists, advocates of psychedelic liberation, participants in lie-ins and rock festivals, proponents of free love, members of the underground, and advocates of Black Power, women's liberation, and gay liberation believed that by engaging in struggles, giving witness, or simply doing their own thing they were contributing to the final collapse of bad bourgeois society".⁵ Thus, at their very inception, the Leftwing movements which are today in the ascendancy – feminism, 'gay rights', multiculturalism, 'anti-racism', – were infused with the notion that advancing their causes would require the eradication of the existing order. Undoubtedly, all of the aggrieved groups upon which these movements thrive had some justifiable complaints against the 'traditional' society of the 1950s, but many became convinced that a destructive cultural revolution, rather than piecemeal reform, was the only remedy.

By the 1990s, the generation of students who were influenced by such thinking were the ones controlling the levers of political and cultural power, and, aided by political correctness, these ideas have thus migrated out of their Leftist ghetto to become mainstream. Meanwhile, libertarians have become the latest converts to the worship of 'change' as an end in itself. One of their number, the American journalist Virginia Postrel, has given the philosophy a name: dynamism. In her book *The Future and Its Enemies*, she categorises political ideologies as either "dynamist" or "stasist" [sic], and in doing so labels anyone – Right or Left – who is not a libertarian as an "enemy of the future". As the future is obviously inevitable, this

rhetorical trick portrays all non-libertarians as Canute-like figures, trying to hold back the tide of progress.


Discussing the Conservatives' woes, a *Spectator* columnist recently suggested that the average Tory MP was perceived as "an absurd creep with extreme Rightwing views who is frightened of the future and knows only how to appeal to others like himself", with the clear implication that being seen as "frightened of the future" is almost as damaging as being labelled "absurd" or "extreme".⁶ Similarly, the respectable politician is expected to have an essentially positive attitude to the social changes that have occurred in recent decades in Western societies. One of Portillo's cheerleaders recently wrote: "There is no future for a Right in Britain which is unwilling to sue for peace with the 1960s. It is not sufficient for Conservatives reluctantly to accept that social attitudes have altered and therefore public policy must evolve as well. The Right needs to compete with the Left ... over the whole concept and language of rights. The drive for 'inclusion' must involve a full-scale retreat from the outdated theology of 'family values' in favour of a more neutral position between different social arrangements – Portillo's confession of gay affairs in his youth does no harm to this cause".⁷

Insofar as grass-roots Tories have not surrendered to the spirit of the 1960s, it is often assumed that this is because they remember too fondly the era before it. As anyone observing their current agonies will know, the average Conservative Party member is in their mid-60s, and the party's detractors link the membership's advanced age to their supposedly extremist views. As a similarly superannuated *Independent* journalist wrote recently: "this pre-1960s generation wants history wound back to where it was in 1960 and given another turn – to see if it comes out better this time. They haven't accepted the social revolution".⁸

Of course, the riposte to this is to ask why they should accept it. The social revolution that has occurred throughout the West since the 1960s has been as injurious to human happiness as many a political revolution. In his book *The Great Disruption*, Francis Fukuyama has catalogued the enormous and unprecedented increase internationally of numerous social ills that has characterised the last four decades. Although Fukuyama is an optimist who believes that the West's social order will spontaneously reconstitute itself, it is important for conservatives that such an important liberal intellectual acknowledges the scale of the social catastrophe. Many on the Left seek to portray the 1950s and early 1960s as a sort of Dark Age in dire need of liberal enlightenment, thus condemning those who are nostalgic for that era as obscurantist reactionaries.

Yet a brief glance at the website of the Office for National Statistics reveals that the facts about Britain's social problems

speak for themselves, especially in the fields of crime and family breakdown. Overall recorded crime has fallen recently, but is still almost four times what it was in 1965.⁹ Meanwhile, violent crime continues to rise: in England and Wales, crimes categorised as "violence against the person" have more than doubled since 1981, whilst incidences of robbery have more than tripled over the same period. Divorce rates are over six times what they were in 1961, which is undoubtedly a major cause of unhappiness. The proportion of births outside marriage has increased eightfold since 1954, and although many of the parents of these children subsequently marry, many do not. As a result, the proportion of households with dependent children that are headed by a single parent has increased from 8% to 24% since 1971. The ill effects of the decline of the nuclear family on children can be studied in the numerous publications that emanate from the Institute for the Study of Civil Society, in particular the classic *Families without Fatherhood* by former Labour councillor Norman Dennis.



Herbert Marcuse: leading New Left thinker of the Frankfurt school – and leading New Right thinker of the Portillo school?

Furthermore, these developments do not just affect children, but signify a more general atomisation of society. Due to the decline of marriage and the increase in divorce and single-motherhood, the proportion of households that consist of a single man aged 15-44 has quadrupled since 1971, whilst 35.6% of men born in 1964 had never been married by the age of 35, compared to 11.6% of those born in 1946. These statistics indicate that a significant proportion of a whole generation of men have either never known the civilising responsibilities of marriage and fatherhood, or are leading solitary lives whilst being fleeced by the Child Support Agency for the maintenance of offspring with whom they seldom spend time. These developments are probably related to the

fact that the suicide rate for men aged 25-44 has almost doubled since 1971. Meanwhile, the total number of births has fallen by 29% since 1964, contributing to the aging of the population, and increased strains on the NHS and pension funds. As Francis Fukuyama notes: "What other consequences will emerge for societies that in effect refuse to reproduce themselves, we can scarcely imagine".¹⁰

It is worth remembering that all this has occurred during a period when the expansion of our economy and rapid technological progress would have suggested to our 1950s forebears that we ought to be living in an earthly paradise. However, we have not only failed to build the New Jerusalem during the last half-century, but we face several new problems in the next, such as the threat of an autocratic and centralised European Union, environmental degradation, resource depletion, and rapid ethnic diversification which could undermine political stability. Of course, cataloguing all these problems does not bring us much closer to finding solutions to them, but the current climate of opinion is hostile to any suggestion that some things may have been better in the 1950s, before the sexual revolution and multiculturalism.

Nevertheless, when the aforementioned issues are considered together, is there really any reason to either feel grateful for the recent past, or optimistic about the future? Now that they have fallen under the spell of Postrel's "dynamism", the libertarian Right is simply not engaging with this question, and only seems able to take a principled stand against Euro-federalism. Perhaps they believe that "things really are getting better and better", or maybe they just hope that appearing optimistic and 'tolerant' will get the Tories a fair hearing from the BBC, *Independent* and *Guardian*. Either way, the derision with which the Portillistas now treat traditionalism and populism will hamper any revival of a unified yet broad Conservative Party. □

Dr David Worsley writes from Cheshire

Footnotes

1. John Blundell & Brian Gosschalk, *Beyond Left and Right*, London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1997
2. The conservative-inclined portion of these 'authoritarians' are more commonly referred to as populists or traditionalists
3. Geoffrey K Fry, "Parliament and 'Morality': Thatcher, Powell and Populism", *Contemporary British History*, Vol 12, No 1, 1998, pps 139-147
4. Tim Hames, "Michael Portillo", *Prospect*, June 2001
5. Arthur Marwick, *The Sixties*, Oxford: OUP, 1998, p10
6. Andrew Gimson, "The Tories Are Finished", *Spectator*, 10 November 2001
7. Tim Hames, *op cit*
8. Andreas Whittam Smith, "The Sixties Claims Its Last Victim – the Conservative Party", *Independent*, 27 August 2001
9. In fact, recorded crime in 1999 was over nine times what it was in 1955, but it seems likely that a lot of the increase between 1955 and 1965 was due to increased reporting of crime
10. Francis Fukuyama, *The Great Disruption*, London: Profile, 1999, p. 115

The proportionality thesis

Ezra Mishan asks if quotas will really make the world a better place

When they have nothing better to do, many media commentators succumb to the temptation to dabble in the proportionality thesis – generally to wax indignant on discovering marked discrepancies, within any organisation or occupation, of the proportion of persons associated with a ‘minority group’ compared with their numbers in the population at large.

As fair-minded citizens, we are expected to regard such discrepancies as significant – arising, that is, from unfair practices or, at least, from lack of proper encouragement of the members of the minority group in question.

The more ubiquitous examples of the proportionality thesis are, of course, those bearing on the representation of women in any organisation – women being currently regarded as a sort of honorary minority group. At all events, feminists are ever active in highlighting the relatively small numbers of women in parliament, university faculties, managerial positions in business and in the higher echelons of the judiciary, civil service and the armed forces – a disproportion attributed, not surprisingly, to ‘gender discrimination’.

Hardly less frequent are allegations of continued racial and ethnic discrimination by Britain’s vociferous race relations industry, often adducing as evidence their insufficient representation in various professions or on various official boards or commissions.

Recently, stratagems for producing a more ‘representative’ House of Commons have been mooted, special attention being given to women and to blacks and Asians which may, by extension, lead to a consideration of the present lack of proper representation of senior citizens, single mothers, homosexuals, the disabled and of any other distinguishable group that may be able to exert political pressure.

Sisyphean sums

If we reject the view that a disproportion of a minority in any occupation is of itself unjust, we may confine ourselves to three questions.

First, is it practicable to eliminate the existing disproportions in the representation of minorities among the various occupations?

Second, are significant reductions in the prevailing disproportions – assuming they can be effected – likely to be beneficial to society?

Third, should the prevalence of a conspicuous disproportion in any occupation or membership be accepted as *prima facie* evidence of discriminatory policies or practices?

The simple answer to the first question is no. In fact, it is feasible to calculate representative quotas for the various minority or other groups only if they are relatively few in number.

By restricting ambition to making provision for no more than three groups in Britain, for whites, blacks and Asians, membership in any occupations can be divided into no more than six categories, since men and women have to be featured in each group. With respect to the number of members in the Commons or in a university faculty – say, between six and eight hundred – an ‘ideal’ composition may be easily calculated and, possibly, enforced through the application of ‘affirmative action’ or ‘positive discrimination’. But this quest for an ideal representative composition becomes more laborious to calculate and to enforce as the minorities eligible for representation increase.

During one of my teaching stints in the US, I became involved in the controversy about affirmative action within the teaching staff of the university. Among the complaints of proponents of affirmative action was the allegation that the number of women teachers – although well below the required


quota – was largely white. Moreover, the quotas for minorities were too broad. The black quota, it was suggested, ought properly to be divided into native blacks, Caribbean blacks, Haitian blacks and the more recently arrived African blacks. Similarly, the Latino quota should be split into separate quotes for Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and a residuum made up of immigrants from South and Central America. Finally, Orientals would require quotas for the Chinese, the Japanese and Koreans, at least, with Asian quotas for recent immigrants from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Burma⁽¹⁾.

If now we allow that whites in the US continue to be treated as an homogenous group irrespective of origin, and accept that roughly a half of each of the minority quotas mentioned are women, there will be 34 quotas to be filled in each university. They will obviously vary greatly in size, the quota for, say, Cubans being less than one half of one percent of the university staff. In a fairly large university with about 600 teachers, three Cubans would suffice to fill their quota: one-and-a-half men and one-and-a-half women – say one full-time and one part-time teacher of each sex.

But suppose a minority group to be formed from the descendants of marriages between Caribbean blacks and Cubans. Such a minority can claim to have as much a right to affirmative action as any other. If, however, there are but 30,000 members of this minority, proportionality entitles them to no more than .01 per cent of the teaching staff of a university. This looks decidedly awkward. In a university of about 600 teachers, the male quota for this minority would be .03 of a person, likewise for the female quota. However, bearing in mind that the average university teacher puts in about 100 hours of teaching each year, this seeming difficulty might be overcome by allocating to each of them about three teaching hours a year – though a smaller university of, say, 100 teachers would afford them only half an hour a year each. It may be conjectured that this arrangement would be of more benefit to the two three-hour teachers than to the students.

Commentary on the advantages to the students, or to the community at large, of the composition of an academic staff selected by reference to race as much as to merit is unnecessary. The only question is the feasibility of enforcing affirmative action as the number of minorities claiming quota-eligibility increases over time, and this with respect not only to universities but to all other occupations, professions or committees.

A leading American magician illustrates the correct technique for obtaining fractional academics to fulfil quota obligations in smaller educational institutions



Causing resentment and distrust

The answer to the second question has to some degree been anticipated in the preceding paragraph. Even if a case in social justice for affirmative action could somehow be contrived, its implementation necessarily conflicts with the method of appointment based on merit alone.


What is more, a general awareness of official commitment to positive discrimination in favour of women and racial minorities cannot but create a prejudice in the mind of the public against the beneficiaries of this system. The unfortunate consequence is that each member of a minority group within a prestigious profession or select body carries a sort of stigma: he tends to be viewed with scepticism, no matter how qualified or skilled he actually is. Even those who support a policy of positive discrimination in the belief that it promotes social justice would hesitate to act on their principles if, for instance, they had the choice of flying to Australia with an affirmative action pilot, of studying for a science degree under an affirmative action tutor, employing an affirmative action barrister if on trial for their life, or choosing an affirmative action brain surgeon where a slip of the knife could be fatal.

To be sure, it may more plausibly be argued that quotas based on proportionality are fitting enough in the case of the House of Commons, at least if we disregard self-proclaimed minorities such as homosexuals or the aged and infirm and restrict ourselves to broad categories, say women, blacks and Asians. The argument advanced for such quotas, however, often rest on a misapprehension of representative democracy, one that misconceives representation as proportionality, the ideal chamber of representatives being one that is in effect a microcosm of the community at large.

Yet only in a community where the vital material interests of the various broad groups are in conflict can there be a case for proportional representation. In the absence of such a condition, the ideal member of parliament is surely one who – irrespective of their sex or ethnic origin – is best able to represent the interests of their constituency and best able also to contribute to the formation of national policy.

True, so long as political parties continue to dominate political activity the choice of a suitable candidate for a given constituency has perforce to be left to judgement of local party members. Quota constraints imposed by the central party requiring a given constituency to nominate only a woman, a

black woman or Asian male, obviously abridge the freedom of local party members to exercise their own political judgement. Such constraints cannot but arouse resentment among the local members in consequence of which numbers willing to participate in political activity will decline. And in so far as ability or integrity or experience have to give way to quota requirements the overall vigilance and competence of the House are diminished.



Disproportionality proves nothing

A consideration of the third question needed not detain us long. The credibility of such an inference – an under-representation of any minority group being attributed to discrimination – was made risible by comedian Jackie Mason in a mock accusation of anti-Semitism among plumbers in the London area since it was virtually impossible to find there a Jewish plumber.

Apart from ambition to enter certain professions or occupations, which are not to be supposed to be equally dispersed among men and women or among minority groups, there are also innate endowments, mental or physical, and often also the patience, self-discipline and endurance to undertake the years of training or apprenticeship necessary for qualification and admittance. Again, relevant aspects of character for worldly success cannot be assumed to be equally disseminated among the various races. Neither is there reason to assume that among each of the racial or ethnic groups there will be equal parental care and sacrifice for their children, equal educational encouragement, and equal financial resources to help them in their careers. On the contrary, there is ample evidence to support the common belief that a long tradition of learning, perseverance in

study, ambition and expectation of success, are distinctly more pronounced among some racial groups than among others.

Once we recognise that nature is unfair in its distribution of genetic endowments, and other natural advantages and characteristics, not only as between individuals but also – albeit to a lesser extent – among the various ethnic groups, it should be manifest that one cannot reasonably expect a proportional representation of these groups in all the

occupations and professions. It follows that any departure from proportionality, whether mild or marked, cannot properly be interpreted as *prima facie* evidence of discrimination.

Admittedly, nepotism and prejudice may continue to favour undeserving individuals. Therefore, although there can be no presumption of any tendency toward a proportional representation in all professions and occupations, neither can we preclude the possibility that there may be cases when unwarranted discrimination may contribute to the disproportionality in any one or more professions and occupations.

In conclusion, the existence of disproportionality of itself in the composition of any profession or occupation cannot be accepted as *prima facie* evidence of unwarranted discrimination, conscious or unconscious. Such

discrimination may well exist. But allegations of discrimination may be vindicated only by uncovering indisputable evidence of a policy or practice of purposeful discrimination. □

Footnote

1. One must assume that the numbers calculated for any quota apply to the university teaching staff as a whole. It would be virtually impossible for the protected minorities to be proportionally represented in each of the university departments bearing in mind that some of them, such as the Department of Astrophysics, will have no more than five or six on the teaching staff.

New Patron

We are delighted to announce that Ezra Mishan has become a patron of *Right Now!* A frequent contributor to the magazine, Professor Mishan was for many years professor of economics at the London School of Economics, and has also taught in the United States.

He has also written many highly-regarded books concentrating on economic and environmental themes and also contributes to academic and political journals at home and abroad.

A real Pillar of Hercules

Michael Brufal de Melgarejo says that Gibraltar's stiff resistance to Blair and the Spanish may be paying off

Who is the guilty man who instigated the negotiations with the Spanish government to surrender, during the year of the Golden Jubilee, half of Her Majesty's sovereignty over the Crown Colony and Garrison of Gibraltar against the wishes of each and every Gibraltarian?

It certainly was not a Spanish politician, as the last thing the Spanish government desires is any immediate retrocession of sovereignty. Politically this would be disastrous in view of the Moroccan government's claim over the Spanish enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla, the Portuguese government's claim to Olivenza, the demands for a referendum from the Catalan and Basque governments, and the fact that Gibraltar can hardly be promised a more generous constitution than that granted to any of Spain's autonomous regions.

Gibraltar's current 1969 colonial constitution, which needs serious revision to eliminate all traces of colonialism, is considerably more autonomous than any devolution of powers to Spain's regions. How can the Spanish Prime Minister agree to even more self-government for the Gibraltarians? Should this come about, then the retrocession of sovereignty to the Spanish crown might also signal the end of the Spanish state as it is today.

All the circumstantial evidence points to Tony Blair, the putative President of the European Union, as being the instigator of the present round of Brussels process talks.

It is said that Tony Blair approached José Maria Aznar and asked him what would be the political price for the Spanish government to form an alliance with Britain and Italy to combat the Franco-German axis within the European Union.


The Spanish Prime Minister, always ready to grab the main chance, replied that the price would be a total retrocession of sovereignty over Gibraltar. Even Tony Blair saw that this could not be achieved and so they compromised on a joint sovereignty deal. But at this point in the negotiations some nine months ago neither side mentioned that there were 'red lines' that could not be crossed; none of these involved the Gibraltarians who might be regarded by dispassionate observers as holding the key to any eventual solution to the Gibraltar problem. Indeed, no ministers or diplomats had bothered to sound out the views of the Gibraltar government and when they did, soon found that at enormous battle was about to begin.

Last month, the British Foreign Secretary, tired of being accused of cowardice by the members of the All Party

Gibraltar Parliamentary group, paid an away day visit to Gibraltar. Jack Straw was told in no uncertain terms what the Gibraltarians thought about the Prime Minister's intentions. It took more than 200 members of the Royal Gibraltar Police force to bundle the Foreign Secretary from his meeting with the Chief Minister the 75 metres from Peter Caruana's office to the safety of the Convent, the home of David Durie, the Blairite civil servant appointed as Governor and Commander in Chief of the Garrison of Gibraltar. Pictures of Jack Straw's humiliation were beamed around the world and all because he was trying to force British subjects to surrender half the sovereignty of their homeland to another State. Jack Straw was also told in no uncertain terms by both

that the next Conservative government will abrogate any agreement of principles, provided it is rejected by the Gibraltarians in any referendum.

This pledge greatly upset the Spanish government. Whilst they did not wish for any physical transfer of sovereignty, the Spanish Prime Minister, knowing that any agreement of principles would be rejected in the subsequent referendum, wished to enter the Spanish history books as the Spanish Prime Minister who obtained a cast-iron agreement from the British government that at a later date the transfer of half the sovereignty would take place. This might come in several decades time when geopolitics has dictated that Ceuta and Melilla have to be handed back to Morocco. No less a political personage than Manuel Fraga Iribarne, the former Spanish Ambassador to the Court of St James and present President of Galicia, warned that whatever happens in Gibraltar will be mirrored in Ceuta and Melilla and vice versa. All in Gibraltar are well aware that if the King of



Indigestible? Gibraltarians find Jack Straw's (left) claims that he is not selling out the Rock to José Maria Aznar (above) hard to swallow...

the Spanish Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary that the shared sovereignty would be followed by a total retrocession of sovereignty.

The Conservative Party have supported the Gibraltarians in their battle to withstand the Labour government's attempts to hand over the Rock to the Spanish crown as they did in the years of the Wilson Government in the mid 1960s. Michael Ancram has made two visits to the colony this year and takes every opportunity to try and persuade the Labour government to alter its policy and stop the talks. Michael put the cat amongst the pigeons when in March this year he said that the next Conservative government cannot be bound by any agreement between the Spanish and British governments with which they have openly and clearly disagreed. This is lawyer-speak for a pledge

Morocco leads another 'green march' into Ceuta and Melilla then the Spaniards will follow suit across the Gibraltar border. That is why it is very much in the interests of the Gibraltarians and the Spaniards to retain the sovereignty status quo.

Last month, Iain Duncan-Smith decided to visit Gibraltar the day after a visit to Madrid to hold talks with the Spanish Prime Minister. José Maria Aznar, having tried without success to persuade Michael Ancram to water down his pledge not to be bound by any agreement of principles, then attempted to blackmail the Conservative Party leader into cancelling his visit to Gibraltar. Naturally, Iain Duncan Smith refused and so his trip to Madrid was postponed indefinitely. He went on to receive a hero's welcome on the Rock where he said that the Labour government had entered

these talks without listening to the views of the Gibraltar government. If they had stopped and listened they would have realised that the talks were bound to fail. He went on to call for the suspension of the Anglo-Spanish talks on joint sovereignty and for them to be taken off the negotiating table where there would be the temptation to bully the Gibraltarians into eventually accepting them. He pointed out that although the Conservative Party had started the Brussels process in 1987 they had always rejected any joint sovereignty proposals from the Spaniards.

What is not generally known is that the Spanish government is currently attempting to persuade the Polish government not to send a ministerial delegation to Gibraltar on 4th July 2003 to mark the 60th anniversary of the death of General Sikorski. It does look as if they will succeed because the Polish Government needs all the support they can muster if they are to succeed in their bid to become a member of the European Union in 2004.

However, all is not doom and gloom, as it appears that for different reasons both Prime Ministers wish to back off from signing the agreement of principles. Tony Blair held a meeting recently with back bench Labour members of the Gibraltar Parliamentary Group and reliable sources indicate that he suggested that there was no need to continue agitating, as both sides would agree to discontinue the Brussels Process talks because of the sacred 'red lines' of each side. This would enable both governments to withdraw with honour without acknowledging the brilliant defence masterminded by the Chief Minister of Gibraltar.

The meeting in Downing Street last month between the two Prime Ministers was inconclusive, with neither wishing to talk about Gibraltar at the subsequent press conference. No 10's guidance was that the respective 'red lines' were proving to be insuperable.

A reception was held last week at the Royal Commonwealth Society to thank the organisers of the Plymouth petition of 32,000 signatures demanding that the Prime Minister stops the talks. Lindsay Hoyle, the Labour Chairman of the All Party Gibraltar Parliamentary Group who was present at the meeting with the Prime Minister, said these prophetic words: "I think that the battle is nearly over. I am 98% certain that the talks are coming to an end. But the next few weeks will be crucial and the pressure must be maintained on the British government. It must continue until the day we hear the news that the two governments have walked away from the talks, thus ensuring that the Gibraltarians have retained their right to determine their own future". □

Michael Brufal de Melgarejo
is a Gibraltarian living
in England

Hands Across the Irish Sea

Raymond F Arnold describes a new initiative to bring mainland and Ulster Unionists closer together

The Belfast Agreement (popularly the Good Friday Agreement) of 1998 received majority backing from the people of Northern Ireland, and undoubtedly had overwhelming support from the people of the British mainland. But when we look at the two communities, unionist and nationalist, the picture was different – huge support from nationalists, but a substantial part of unionist opinion was always sceptical. Since then, unionist support for the Agreement has been steadily haemorrhaging so that now there is a real question whether the unionist community is still mostly in favour.

But here on the mainland, most people are still convinced that the 'peace process' has brought about wonderful improvements – so what are those unionists moaning about? The people at the sharp end, who know the reality of the situation, understandably feel isolated and misunderstood.

Hands Across the Irish Sea (HAIS) is seeking to bring the people of mainland Britain and the beleaguered people of Northern Ireland closer together. We want to stretch out a hand of sympathy and support, and to listen to their hopes and fears; and then to be their voice to the government, parliament, media and public on this side of the water.

If you would like to help with this work, please write to me at 15a Wynford Rd, Exeter, Devon, EX4 7ES, or 'phone (01392) 477369.

RESISTANCE AGAINST THE EURO

South House, Headington Hill, Oxford, OX3 0BT, UK. Tel: +44 (0)1865 761792

- * The Euro has now been imposed upon the peoples of Europe, in most cases without a popular vote or mandate.
- * The Euro is an openly-declared political weapon to forge a unified superstate, the European Union.
- * The European Union is centralised, authoritarian and anti-democratic; the so-called "European Parliament" has no real powers, they all rest with the unelected European Commission.
- * The European Union now has one flag, one anthem, one currency, a propaganda department and a puppet parliament.
- * And it will soon also have one legal system, one army, and one police force.
- * The European Union is gaining all the hall-marks of a totalitarian state.
- * Such states breed war and oppression-, not peace and prosperity, as has happened twice in Europe in the last century.
- * Now is the time to alert the peoples of Europe to the dangers they face, and the threats to their democracies.
- * We have a duty to remind everyone of the lessons of history, and of the last attempt to forge a unified Europe, in 1939–1945.

RESISTANCE AGAINST THE EURO has therefore produced campaigning stickers. They are available from the above address at a cost of £7.00 per thousand (including postage). Please send payment with order.



CFW

**CONCERN FOR FAMILY
AND WOMANHOOD**

Charity 291323

**Do you believe that the
traditional sex roles and the
traditional family are best for our
society, and that feminism has
gone far too far? Then join us!**

**Enquiries: CFW,
Springfield House
Chedworth, Cheltenham.**

**Tel: 01285 720454
Website: www.cfw.org.uk**

"English Witness"

"English Witness" is a planned Steadfast compilation of essays from English people giving their reactions to and thoughts about what has happened to England in the last 50 years, and their hopes and fears about the future. Of particular interest are contributions from people who can remember the Second World War.

For more information, contact:
P. Scrivener, Steadfast,
27 Old Gloucester Street,
London, WC1N 3XX.

Illegal immigration – who benefits?

Hal Colebatch wonders why the government doesn't *do* something about illegal immigration

The inflow of illegal immigrants through the Channel Tunnel is popularly blamed on the perfidy of the French authorities in deliberately locating the Sangatte camp close to the tunnel and offering the illegals tacit encouragement to use this opportunity.

This is correct, but it is not the whole picture. The British Government has made repeated protests, but beyond mere protests, it could put real pressure on the French to guard their end of the tunnel seriously. This is a question of Britain's core national interests. There is, at the time of writing, no evidence that that is being done.

The measures taken to guard the British end seem strangely ineffectual: how difficult should it be to police a tunnel? The answer is: not very difficult, given the slightest determination. A tunnel is by definition a narrow choke-point. Traffic could, if necessary, be stopped and examined while still inside it. Suppose the tunnel had been there in 1940 – surely measures would have been taken at the British end to effectively stop invaders pouring through? Looking at Britain's handling of the situation it is hard to avoid the conclusion that at some level there is active or passive connivance at the illegal influx.

The Government's reaction or non-reaction to the flood of illegal immigrants (immigration minister Lord Rooker has said only one claimant in ten is a genuine refugee) is an illustration of the peculiar culture war being fought in Britain at present. It should go without saying that genuine refugees have a real claim of humanitarian compassion, and that Britain has a very proud record of providing a haven for refugees. But this is a different matter.

The ancient political question, 'Who benefits?' is relevant. *At one level*, the government wishes to solve the problem, just as – *at one level* – it wishes to improve things like education, health and transport. But at another level, the present situation suits the government and the *nomenklatura* associated with it very well. Illegal immigrants who

New voters for new Labour.

'Refugees' attempt to enter the Tunnel: going underground to join the underclass?



are not really fleeing persecution (genuine refugees are often people of valuable skills and energy) but who are attracted to a welfare state in present circumstances tend to increase ghettoisation and Balkanisation of the population. They therefore tend to provide a larger client-group for the government's own clients such as the social work, welfare and race relations industries. This helps destroy the traditional culture of Britain which provides the conservatives' – and the Conservative Party's – support base, and helps distress and demoralise traditional conservatives.

"Illegal immigrants provide... a major reinforcement to the underclass in general"

Very importantly, illegal immigrants provide (or may be expected to provide – there could be some surprises in that direction) a major reinforcement to the underclass in general. Britain has benefited enormously in the past from the vigour and initiative of waves of migrants and refugees, from ancient times to the Cold War. However, context is what matters here. In a success-oriented culture success-oriented

newcomers do well. But many cultural factors in Britain today seem to have the strategic objective of creating a *permanent* underclass of which the illegal immigrants bid fair to be part. It is also important, of course, if Britain is to be subsumed into Europe, to have large client groups and eventual voting coalitions who (unlike so many genuine refugees and legal immigrants of the past) can be expected to have no loyalty to Britain.

Marxism failed in every Western country largely because capitalism gave the workers opportunity for upward social mobility. The United States may be the paradigm example but the same applies in Britain to a very great extent. What we are seeing today looks like something new from the post-Marxist Left: the permanent immiseration of an underclass or *lumpenproletariat* – an army of political cannon-fodder which will never be quite desperate enough to actually rebel (which would be very inconvenient), but which will never vote Tory. A bad education system, a bad health service, proletarianised entertainment like football and lotteries (former Sports Minister Kate Hoey boasted "This Government has been a huge supporter of football!") other factors like bad transport, ghettoisation and a large population of immigrants without strong incentives for assimilation, self-improvement or patriotism all look like parts of an overarching strategy: the permanent cultural destruction of conservative (and Conservative) Britain with its traditions, values and history – including its sports, its arts and even its landscapes, and the creation of an army of voters and clients who, unlike Marx's working-class, will be unable to desert the cause because they will lack the mental and cultural equipment to do so. Oh yes, and didn't the Government's exceptionally inept handling of the foot-and-mouth crisis – ignoring scientific advice for months – just happen to have the outcome of helping the Left politically, by helping destroy a conservative rural and countryside culture?



"Red sky at night – Asylum centre's alight" – traditional country saying.

The Yarl's Wood detention centre is set ablaze by the 'persecuted refugees' to whom it offers sanctuary.

**An Algerian
'asylum
seeker' on
his way to
Bedford
Magistrates
Court after the
Yarl's Wood
blaze**



A few people have already said the point of the sink-comprehensive education system is to produce Labour voters. A Britain where the culture described by Doctor 'Theodore Dalrymple' in his *Spectator* columns is permanent and near-universal would suit New Labour and the *nomenklatura* with which it has an ambiguous alliance very nicely indeed, as it would make the conservatives' and Conservatives' chances of either political or cultural survival impossible.

The tacit encouragement of waves of illegal immigrants is part of a multi-faceted process of cultural destruction. This is not, I think, simple conspiracy. I do not think people like Tony Blair and David Blunkett consciously want a large underclass in permanent immiseration. The situation is complex and unprecedented. It seems that elected politicians are not in control of the process and are perhaps not fully aware of the culture-war being waged beneath them.

"The tacit encouragement of waves of illegal immigrants is part of a multi-faceted process of cultural destruction"

In another aspect of the culture-war, Home Officer Minister John Denham was surprised when he was told by police officers that expressions like "nitty-gritty" and "good egg" are banned and police who use them can face disciplinary actions because these phrases have almost unimaginably tenuous and obscure 'racist' connotations. However, Blair launched deliberate culture-war against the so-called "forces of conservatism," has tacitly gone along with all kinds of excesses, and is not a mere innocent.

If it is not conspiracy in the conventional sense of that term, it is not mere coincidence either. With the defeat of communism the Left's great political project has been replaced by a great cultural project. The flood of illegal immigrants through the Channel Tunnel, and the government's near-paralysis in the face of this, appears to be one facet of that project. □

Hal GP Colebatch is a lawyer

Overlooked Britain

A detail from the interior of East Wellow church in Hampshire.

Florence Nightingale, who lived nearby, is buried in the churchyard. The church is most famous for its 13th Century wall paintings – a woman with a spindle gazing at a knight, with crowned figures looking on, part of St Christopher holding a child and a very faint picture of the murder of Thomas á Becket.

The nearby town of Romsey is famous for its abbey, and for being home to both Lord Palmerston and Lord Mountbatten. The abbey contains important Anglo-Saxon carvings and several impressive monuments.



A lasting legacy

Right Now! aims to recapture our civilisation from the enemies of the West. This is a long term project, and requires long term commitment from all involved. Central to such long term aims is lasting financial support from those who can afford it.

By remembering *Right Now!* in your will, you can ensure that the magazine can continue to expand and advance, even after you have gone.

To find out more, please write to: PO Box 2085, London, W1A 5SX, or telephone (0845) 601 3243 or e-mail rightnow@compuserve.com

CONSERVATIVE DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE



"THE REAL CONSERVATIVES"!

That's what hundreds of disillusioned and despairing grass-roots Tories are saying about the new Conservative Democratic Alliance.

Originally formed to fight the unlawful and unjust Central Office purge of the Monday Club, the CDA has in the space of just a few months gained unprecedented media attention and many hundreds of supporters from the increasingly moribund Tory Party. Now the fightback is really beginning.

If you are appalled by Duncan Smith's silence on Europe; if you despair whenever you hear Francis Maude or John Bercow pushing the *Guardian-Independent* line on "group rights", gay politics and positive discrimination; if you wonder why there is no opposition to New Labour, your place is with us — in the Conservative Democratic Alliance.

If Duncan Smith and his lacklustre "Shadow Cabinet" cannot or will not provide real opposition or real Conservatism, WE WILL!

The CDA is an informal alliance within the broad church. The party belongs to the members, not Central Office careerists.

Contact our information line on 0797 431 2075; write to us at: BCM 9045, London WC1N 3XX; or visit our website at <http://conservativedemocrats.20m.com>

Does sex education *actually* work?

Ray Honeyford asks if sex 'education' has been a waste of time and money

The government of the day has tried over many years to halt the ever-increasing tide of sexual misbehaviour amongst young people. And sex education has consistently been assumed to be the answer. As far back as 1942 the Board of Education issued guidance on what should be done, in a publication entitled *Sex Education in School and Youth Organisations*. And pretty well every official report bearing on the school curriculum ever since has stressed the value of sex education. Thus, the *Newsom Report* of 1963 states, "Positive Guidance to Boys and Girls in Sexual Behaviour is Essential". And to bring the story up to date we have, 'Sex and Relationship Education and Parents' issued in 2001. This document states, "Parents/Carers have the right to withdraw their child from some, or all, Sex Education and Relationship Education lessons but not statutory science lessons" – which allows any school to impose sex education in defiance of parental wishes so long as the thing is called science.

Now the value and effectiveness of sex education has been constantly stressed by the sex education lobby. Such organisations as the Family Planning Association, Brook (Advisory Centres), the International Family Planning Federation, the Health Education Council, the British Medical Association and the Sex Education Forum have, over the years, formed a formidable lobby group, and it is their advice and their propaganda which has been the major influence on the state's response to the business of sex education.

The version of human sexuality purveyed by this lobby is strictly utilitarian and mechanistic. According to them sex is a form of recreation, where the only limitations are the avoidance of disease and the prevention of pregnancy. Under the lobby's influence sex education has become increasingly explicit, permissive and morally detached – the conjoining of organs, and nothing more. All that matters is the giving of pleasure, whilst the link between sexual behaviour and the emotions, the begetting of children and the family is ignored.

Given the confidence of the sex education lobby, not to mention the huge sums of public money it absorbs, one would surely be forgiven for assuming that the thing fulfils its aims, that parents and teachers can confidently expect that the children will be protected against unwanted pregnancy and disease after being subjected to the much vaunted techniques of the sex experts.

But such reasonable expectations I am afraid would be seriously undermined by the facts. The truth is that British youngsters have the worst sexual health in Europe. The figures for under-age sex, teenage pregnancy,

age of first intercourse and sexually transmitted diseases are, by common consent appalling. Apart from the occasional blip on the graph, the situation is steadily growing worse. The manifest insecurity of its practitioners provides little hope of things improving so long as the sex educators' ideology prevails.

A key event throws light on the matter of evaluating sex education. In 1997 the great and the good of the sex education lobby met in a workshop put on by the BMA Foundation for Aids. The participants included academics, researchers, teacher trainers, advisers, consultants, information officers, various grant-seekers, an 'adolescent programme manager', and a well-known sex educator from the USA – better representation of the sex education intelligentsia would be hard to find.

The object of the exercise was to discuss ways of evaluating sex education lessons. The resulting paper was published on the internet under the title, *Using effectiveness research to guide the development of school sex education lessons*. We learn from this that sex education must be formal, with specially trained staff to deliver it. Nothing is to be left to chance. There should be an attempt to establish "consumer satisfaction" involving pupils, teachers, and parents, and "integrated frameworks" must be used to help in this task. The aim is to influence pupils' understanding, knowledge and attitudes, but there should be no reference to the notion of desirable values or ideals, goals or standards upon which actions and beliefs may be based: "The aim is not to assess whether pupils' attitudes conform to a particular set of values, but how clearly they have thought about and are able to discuss the issues".

In other words, there should be no specific moral guidance from the teacher. The ethical aspect of sexual behaviour should be of no concern to the teacher. The teacher's only function is to ensure that his pupils are aware of the 'issues' whatever they may be from time to time.

The notion of moral absolutes, of right and wrong, in relation to sex, has no place in the teacher's duties. Skills to be developed include 'Getting condoms and using them correctly', and 'Use of sexual health services'. This is followed by the truly astonishing, but dramatically revealing statement, "there is no consensus as to whether age of first intercourse, or decreasing number of partners, are always desirable outcomes". If there is no agreement amongst the experts about these crucially important matters, then it seems that at least some of those offering advice to schools actually

favour earlier sexual intercourse, and have no objection to promiscuity.

Under the criteria for judging the quality of research there appear no fewer than eleven desiderata, including "identifying how sex education best meets the particular needs of groups such as young people who are growing up gay, lesbian and bisexual, and/or are from the minority ethnic communities."

There are two problems with this. First, no one has any right to assume that a child in school will not grow up to be sexually normal. The aetiology of homosexuality is the subject of considerable controversy and for teachers to be selecting particular children and identifying them as either homosexual or bisexual at such an early age, when they still have a great deal of psychosexual development before them, is surely presumptuous and irresponsible. Secondly, the reference to ethnic minorities is ironic. Muslim parents, as well as Sikhs and Hindus, and parents who originate in Roman Catholic Goa, would be horrified at the sort of amoral and explicit sex education being offered by these experts.

What we have here is a mission statement from a large and growing vested interest intent on imposing on schools a version of human sexuality which would meet the highly dubious sexual speculations of one Alfred J Kinsey and his acolytes. There is the same passionless and dreary commitment to sex as a set of techniques, which constitute, not the expression of spontaneous and intense feelings between male and female, which carry with them the possibility of new human life, but the fear-based avoidance behaviour of so-called safe sex, and the condom culture.

But perhaps the most striking thing about this miserable report is that, whilst its whole purpose is to spread sweetness and light about the evaluation of sex education, its authors are distinctly coy about whether sex education can, in fact, be evaluated at all. Here is what they say: "It may not be possible to demonstrate whether a sex education programme succeeds in meeting aims, or to distinguish the impact of the programme from other factors it may be unrealistic to expect research to show that school sex education has *any* [original emphasis] directly measurable behaviourable outcomes."

Can any human enterprise have been so manifestly damned with the faintest of faint praise? If something as dubious as sex education cannot be effectively evaluated, what is the point of continuing it in its present form? Why does the government go on investing huge sums of money in an enterprise whose effects we have no way of discerning? Would any other school-based subject be so favoured? It is time to think again about just what sort of approach needs to replace the confused and irresponsible theorising of the men in white coats. □

Ray Honeyford is an educationalist and author

'Get out' movements of Africa

Giuseppe De Santis says that anti-immigration feeling is by no means confined to the West


Anti-immigration movements exist not only in Western countries, but in every part of the world. The media and 'anti-racism' groups rarely have anything to say about racism in Third World countries, but it is widespread and deserves examination. For example, let us look at just some examples of racism in black Africa.

The first example is Ivory Coast. During the 1960s and 1970s, under Felix Houphouët-Boigny's presidency, immigrants from neighbouring countries such as Mali, Niger, Burkina Faso and Guinea were welcomed, and contributed much to Ivory Coast's development by doing poorly-paid jobs in plantations and other sectors shunned by Ivorians. The number of immigrants coming in was so high that in 1988 they accounted for 28% of the total population: the then government encouraged them to settle in the country. In addition, this immigration changed the cultural composition: once it was a mainly Christian country, now Islam is the principal religion (Muslims now constitute 45% of the population). It is small wonder that concern started to increase.

In 1994, the new electoral code deprived non-Ivorians of the right to vote or to stand



Putting his finger on the immigrant problem: Laurent Gbagbo (above) became Ivory Coast's President when it was discovered that his opponent Alassane Outtara (below) was born in Burkina Faso



for the office of president. Bonoua, in the east of the country, passed laws that banned local people from marrying outsiders and made it illegal for foreigners to work in transport or agricultural companies. Duekoué, in the west, and Kong followed: these regions are those containing the greatest concentrations of immigrants. But the breaking point was reached after the 22 October 2000 presidential elections. After the October revolution, during which Ivorians protested against General Robert Guei's attempt to take power by force and forced him to leave the country, other protests followed. The remaining candidates were a socialist, Laurent Gbagbo, and the northern region candidate, Alassane Outtara. Because Outtara had lied about his real nationality (he was born in Burkina Faso and not in Ivory Coast) he was banned from standing as a candidate, so Laurent Gbagbo became president. After that, clashes ensued between each candidate's supporters and violence erupted. Attacks on northerners and foreigners intensified in the capital, Abidjan. People were dragged from their homes and beaten, and their businesses torched. Many were arrested and human rights groups complained of torture and the mass rape of women in barracks. The final results were dramatic: many immigrants, many of whom had lived there for several decades, left the country. Economic damage was huge, but even worse was the damage to Ivory Coast's image. This chaotic situation doesn't encourage foreign investment and the president felt constrained to visit the Lebanese community to try to reassure them (Lebanese nationals have invested a lot of money in Ivory Coast).^{1,2,3}

Racism in Mandela's 'rainbow nation'

Another country that has similar problems is South Africa. Of course ethnic rivalries are not new to South Africa; they were present during the apartheid era, but are now getting worse and worse. High unemployment, soaring crime and widespread AIDS are causing deep concern and many people believe that immigrants are the main source of them.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that these people are not far from the truth: according to the South African Police's Organized Crime Unit, 90% of the drug trade is controlled by Nigerians and Moroccans, passport racketeering by Congolese criminals and Mozambican and Zimbabwean women are disproportionately involved in prostitution. Apart from this, the large numbers of illegal immigrants pouring over the country's borders are blamed for stealing

precious jobs: small wonder that racial abuse, harassment and attacks happen every day. In one incident, a Somali woman who went to South Africa to avoid Somalia's civil war was systematically harassed and, one day, robbed of her goods because "they were made only for South Africans".

In another incident, three foreigners were chased through the carriages of a train: one was thrown off the moving train, the others tried to escape via the roof but were electrocuted. Many immigrants are locked in the Lindela Repatriation Centre until their repatriation: often, when they are on the special repatriation trains they jump off with the collusion of the police on board.

As if this were not enough, the authorities have recently passed a new Immigrant Act that compels people (such as hoteliers and neighbours) to monitor and report on immigrants' activities: in this way there are more incentives to abuse them. Black South Africans' blatant racism is astonishing, especially after the support they received from other Africans when they were fighting against apartheid.⁴

Xenophobic sentiments are also present in Botswana towards African and Asian expatriates, although the main targets are foreign investors: in the past many 'investors' have started businesses in order to qualify for government financial incentives, and then simply left the country. Public anger forced the government to introduce the Citizen Entrepreneurial Development Agency, which aims to help local companies, giving preference to locals in the awarding of consulting contracts and charging school fees to expatriates' children (residents don't pay fees).⁵ Recent attacks have also happened in Libya, where at least 170 immigrants have been killed by Libyans, while many others are being held in concentration camps, before deportation.⁶

Similar sentiments and similar actions are to be found all over Africa, and all over the rest of the world wherever different groups of people are in close proximity. Racial feeling is by no means confined to Westerners who may, in fact, be much less prone to such feelings than other peoples, but is almost taken for granted in black Africa, and other countries like China, India and Mexico whose governments and spokespersons so often complain of 'racism' against their citizens, politicians, 'anti-racists' and media pundits should bear this mind, when next they decide to lecture us about the supposed wickedness of the West. □

Giuseppe De Santis, who writes from London, is a member of the Monday Club

REFERENCES

1. *Focus on Africa*, January-March 2001
2. *Focus on Africa*, October-December 2001
3. *Focus on Africa*, April-June 2001
4. *Focus on Africa*, October-December 2000
5. EIU report, April 2001
6. *Focus on Africa*, October-December 2001

Mote in the Eye

In its issue of 17th May, *Private Eye* assailed *Times* journalist Michael Gove for having been interviewed in *Right Now*, which they said was – crapes! – an “extreme right-wing magazine”. It is noticeable that the *Eye*’s saturnine sense of humour generally disappears when it comes to the subject of immigration, to be replaced by a credulity and reverence on racial matters that would do credit to a *Thought for the Day* presenter. Yet it is curiously pleasing to reveal that Messrs Hislop and Foot are sensible enough not to let their religious principles get in the way of business. It really must be time for us to place some more advertisements in their organ.

Hain joins the ‘racists’


We are pleased to report that our old friend Peter Hain is still demonstrating his legendary political survival skills. Now that the Labour hierarchy has become more rational about race than its Conservative counterpart (which now sounds like Labour, circa 1970), Peter is on a steep learning curve. On 12th May, the Anti-Nazi-League-supporter-turned-democrat, Mugabe-supporter-turned-Mugabe-opponent, Eurosceptic-turned-Europhile Minister for Europe said “British Muslims...must be part of our culture. Muslim immigrants can be very isolationist in their own behaviour and their own customs. That, in the end, is going to create real difficulties...It just takes two to integrate”. His comments were termed “simplistic”, “very sad” and “divisive” by prominent Muslims. Being attacked by his former playmates must be quite discomfiting. One hopes – perhaps in vain – that he will profit from the experience.

Boil-in-the-bag bigot bubbles over

Trouble is brewing in Green-Land, and the source of the pollution is corporate food industry heir George Monbiot, the doyen of squatters, anti-globalisation protesters and *Socialist Worker* sellers. Like many fast-ageing radicals, Monbiot has turned his bilious frustration against erstwhile allies. “Microwave”, as his dwindling fan club call him, uses his *Grauniad* column regularly to lambaste the green movement as a bourgeois frivolity – or worse.

Environmentalists, according to Microwave, are now evil collaborators with the rich when they attempt to conserve rural life. Poor-little-rich-boy Georgie hates English villages, “preserved not in aspic but in vinegar” (7th May 2002). They are “socially exclusive” and should be taxed quite literally into the ground. The boil-in-the-bag bigot advocates Stalinist property confiscation (“There is no room for second homes”), opposes council tenants’ right to buy their homes and castigates greens for failing to unite with the Marxist left.

Georgie’s greatest ire is reserved for



Ecologist writers who go ‘off-message’ and mention cultural identity. Ex-public schoolboy Monbiot gets the vapours at the suggestion that impoverished working-class communities in Lancashire have anything in common with displaced indigenous tribes. He regards the latter as politically correct, and the former as dirty fascist *lumpen* hardly worth re-educating.

Microwave attacks the greens for being anti-globalist instead of ‘internationalist’. His position on green politics and ‘racism’ echoes increasingly that of *Searchlight* magazine, which he cites repeatedly as an information source. As *Searchlight* is notoriously hostile to green politics, could it possibly be using George as a tool to sow some useful GM seeds of dissent? Anti-globalists of the world, look out!

Yasmin loses it (again)

Elizabeth II has given the nation faultless service and represented Britain abroad with grace and matchless style. However, not everyone sees it that way.

Take for instance *Independent* columnist, Yasmin Alibhai-Brown (and we wish someone would). Yas’s recent book on the monarchy and Britishness shows the Queen mutated into a sort of trans-racial figure. Oh my, how terribly daring, original and *Independent*! On Monday 20th May, Yas was at it again, calling the monarchy names from the safety of her largely insignificant column – the *Insolvent* being the least-read newspaper in Britain, a fact not lost on its fed-up owner, Sir Tony O’Reilly. Yas bitched at the Queen, informing us that her family are the most “dysfunctional and greedy in Britain”. Well, we all thought the *Indie* loved dysfunctional families, and considered divorce and all these mix-and-match relationships to be the last word in chic modernity? And as for greed, what about your own beloved First Family – Tuscany Tony and Cherie, with all their dosh, cronies, Euros, long-haul hols and freebies?

But what was really strange was the way in which Yas compared our liking for our monarchy with primitive “African and Middle Eastern idolatry”. Oh dear, isn’t that rather patronising and racist? We do hope Yassie isn’t saying that these African chiefs are savages of some kind.

Beeb bowled out

On Easter Sunday, on Radio 4’s *The World This Weekend*, the news of the Queen Mother’s passing was commented upon in the following charming and respectful way: “...the formalities will be observed, and then a proper debate on the future of the monarchy can get going”.

The programme also expressed its view that “ordinarily, the death of a 101 year-old-woman should not be that much of a surprise”. Yet also “getting going” was something the Beeb could never have predicted: a flood of loyalty, decency and traditionalism. Oh dear, all those expensive modern ‘idents’ between programmes – rastas, salsa dancing and the like – now look so passé and out of place. And still we are forced to pay for it all.

Perhaps a proper debate on the future funding of the BBC can now “get going” instead.

One rule for Birmingham, one for Burnley

Jack Straw deserves credit for his peacemaking efforts in Kashmir, but other Labour figures have made less helpful interventions. Like Councillor Ansar Ali Khan, elected in May to represent the Washwood Heath ward in Birmingham. In April, a local newspaper, the *Sunday Mercury*, obtained copies of some interesting video tapes from the late 1980s and early 1990s.

Mr Khan, then living in Kashmir and an activist with the militant Kashmir Freedom Movement, is shown praising a young boy as a “young *mujahid*”, extolling the virtues of a convicted terrorist, and saying “we will not rest at all until we have had our revenge” on what the howling crowd called “Indian dogs”. In a later video, Councillor Khan is seen urging his supporters to “give blood and make sacrifices” – and he didn’t mean blood transfusion. Despite a high-level internal investigation, Khan was allowed to stand as a candidate. Labour dismissed the newspaper’s campaign as “mischief-making”.

Of course people should be allowed to live down past extravagances – but one suspects that Labour’s much-vaunted generosity of spirit would have been little in evidence had a political opponent been in the same position. For instance, in May the *Observer* reported how Charles “Chimp” Clarke, Labour’s chairman, had worked closely with the extremist magazine *Searchlight* to produce 200,000 anti-BNP leaflets to distribute in Burnley, in which close attention was paid to the real or imagined embarrassing connections of some within the BNP. According to the *Observer*, some Labour figures have even contributed financially – which may be in breach of local election laws. A police investigation is under way. □

Home truths about hunting

Richard Vesterbusch Griffiths, a young huntsman, tells of his experiences of the field

*"Here's to the beagles that fly fast as eagles,
Here's to the beagles, the Old Berkley Beagles!"*


Banning hunting has been one of the major themes of Tony Blair's governments, often tending to distract public scrutiny from the government's less than impressive record on health, education and crime. Having suffered defeat in the House of Lords, the government is still trying to push through the legislation, because of pressure from the Labour backbenches, although the whole affair has become a political embarrassment for Labour. At the time of writing, the government is still engaged in a period of 'consultation' about hunting, but this is almost over – almost certainly to be followed by new legislation to the same end.

Despite energetic campaigning by the Countryside Alliance, many people still view hunting through the spectacles of misconception, lies and propaganda. So it may be worth describing my own experiences in the field.

I was just 14 when I had my first experience of hunting, with a hare-hunting foot pack of beagles, the Old Berkley Beagles (one of the most renowned beagle packs in England). It was in the quaint village of Oving in Buckinghamshire. I was fascinated by my first sight of a pack of beagles – there must have been ten couple (or, to outsiders, 20 dogs) – and the men wearing hunting stocks, riding hats, britches and long green socks, carrying whips. It all appeared to be quite chaotic to begin with, but then the hunting horn signalled the beginning of the chase, and I began to see the well-oiled machine behind the splendid appearance.

By my fourth or fifth hunt I was whipping in. Some of my duties as a whip were fun; others were overwhelmingly boring, depending on whether you were posted on the side of a road or railway, or alongside the hounds. I was whipping in alongside the master of the hounds to begin with, which required a lot of strenuous running but was rewarded by the greatest possible exhilaration. With youth and willingness on my side, I became – or hope I became – a great help to the huntmaster. One of the more amusing tasks I was given was to stop the younger hounds from straying from the pack, and chasing a Chinese water deer half way across Buckinghamshire.

The master is usually able to tell what a hound is pursuing by the pitch of its bark – a high pitched tone means they have discovered a fox, rabbit or deer scent, while a relatively lower tone signifies a hare. The



A detail from *The Grosvenor Hunt*, painted by George Stubbs, 1762

master (and the whole field, for that matter) is able to tell when the hare is tiring. Hares never leave their territory, and so when being chased runs in a circle. Gradually the circle becomes smaller and smaller; so when you are passing the same field more frequently you prepare for the final scene.

It must have been my second or third hunt when I saw my first kill. It was a chop (a kill without a chase). It was so quick I was only aware that the pack had made a kill when someone told me. I could not possibly see how there could be the remotest element of cruelty involved.

Soon I was witnessing kills fairly frequently. I noticed that when the hounds descended on the hare they immediately broke its neck, which resulted in instant death. Then the whole pack proceeded to tear the corpse apart. I saw this over and over again, and not just with the OBB, but also the Christ Church and Farley Hill Beagles (an Oxford University pack).

It doesn't quite fit the accounts we are given of the prey being mercilessly torn apart alive for entertainment. The enjoyment actually lies in watching the working hounds, finding the scent and following it through, the thrill of the chase, and the diverse people you encounter, from binmen and barristers to housewives and students. The killing of foxes by hounds (larger breeds, to match the size of the fox) is comparable to the killing of hares. (I have seen foxes being killed on two occasions, with the Bicester and Aylesbury Vale hounds.)

The real cruelty

It might seem to outsiders that the point of banning hunting is to stop cruelty to animals. Yet a ban would itself necessitate cruelty. The foxes, hares, deer and mink that are hunted by hounds would instead be shot, which inevitably would result in a lot of

animals being maimed, or escaping with bullets in them, to die slow, agonising deaths, or being caught in traps, and again dying slowly and painfully.

I remember seeing a rabbit that had been shot in Oxfordshire, lying on the ground twitching, with blood pouring from its neck like a fountain. One of the shooters picked it up, took a stick and struck it on the head. Several blows later, it eventually died. That sight still haunts me.

The cruelty wouldn't end there. If the hounds are made redundant, what will happen to them? They cannot be sold as pets because they were raised in a pack, and work and play in a pack. They could not cope with being placed in an alien environment, without the rest of their pack. If there is no hunting, the kennels will receive no income, and the hounds' future will be dubious. Those who oppose hunting conveniently neglect to mention the hounds that would have to be shot, some of them puppies no more than a few weeks old.

We often hear from 'animal rights' activists about conserving wildlife. Yet the field sports they detest are themselves a kind of conservation. Landowners or farmers who hunt, or over whose land hunts take place, are aware of the ramifications of removing hedgerows (which hares and foxes need for cover), or the excessive use of certain chemicals. In the interests of good hunting, conservation is practised as a matter of course.


And hunt saboteurs are often guilty of cruelty. I recall a group of saboteurs confronted one of our hunts, and spread false scents, in an attempt to lead the hounds onto a main road, to be run over. So 'cruelty' is not really the issue. The pressure to ban hunting is actually based on class hatred and political bias. People who hunt are seen as upper-class (why is there no fuss about angling?), and people who live in the country are seen as Tories, who don't really matter. Politicians who call themselves liberals seem to have no interest whatever in the civil liberties or minority rights of country people. It doesn't seem very liberal to me to display such blatant prejudice and discriminatory behaviour towards a minority.

Since my first day of hunting it has come to play an integral role in my life. I have come to love it as an art, a science and a rich tradition from the depths of Britain's past. It enriches lives, and injects soul into many rural communities. But don't take my word for it – contact your nearest hunt pack! □

Richard Vesterbusch Griffiths writes from Thame

Editor's Note: Readers should consider participating in the Countryside Alliance protest march in London on the 22nd of September. Marchers are asked to pre-register with the Alliance. The march hotline is 0900 102 0900. Calls are charged at 60p per minute (maximum £1.80), but the funds go to help the Alliance. More information at:

www.countryside-alliance.org



Dark Blue World

Dark Blue World is that rare thing, a brilliant and authentic modern World War II film. It is also that considerably rarer thing, an anti-Communist war film.

Made in Czechoslovakia, it tells the moving and tragic story of the Czech fighter pilots who joined the RAF in World War II, and who, on returning to Czechoslovakia after the war, instead of being greeted as heroes and liberators, were imprisoned in brutal and murderous concentration camps as spies and Enemies of the People. They were not released until the 1950s and the survivors did not receive official rehabilitation until 1991. Various vignettes summon up perfectly the nature of Nazi and Communist totalitarianism.

As a war drama it seems to me impeccable: the scenes of RAF airfields during the Battle of Britain and the action scenes of aerial dogfights are thrilling and look completely authentic – I do not know how they were filmed. In purely cinematic terms I have not seen better. A greater contrast to the ludicrous pseudo-romantic *The English Patient* with – as Frederick Forsyth pointed out – a Tiger-Moth flying about the North African battlefields in Royal Aero Club livery and a double bed in a Cistercian monastery, could not be

imagined. Even the people look real. Don't wait for video, by the way – see it on the biggest screen you can!

I did spot a couple of very minor inaccuracies – a warship in a mantelpiece photograph is American, not British, and circa 1945 not 1940 – but these do not detract from the story. The war scenes and the unspoilt 1940s English countryside are juxtaposed with the post-war concentration camp (a desecrated church), where the pilots' only friend and hope of survival is the German, ex-SS prisoner-doctor whose wartime duty was to watch executions.

Nor does it have *The English Patient's* and *Saving Private Ryan's* mawkish sentimentality. The hero – and he is a hero! – Franta (Frank), loses everything: his country, his Czech girl, his English girl whose missing husband returns, his protégé who dies saving his life, his friends – the Communists kill those the war does not. He remains unbowed.



A scene from the film

"Do you need Kleenex?" I asked rather flippantly to a friend who saw it before me and who recommended it enthusiastically but who described it as "terribly sad."

"No," he answered. And you don't: it is one of the most tragic films I have seen but it is tragedy of the sort that lifts and toughens the spirit.


It reminded me of another unconquerable Franta, one whom I had the honour to know, the late Dr Frank Knopfmacher, a Czech Jew who fought heroically with the British Army in World War II (his family died in the holocaust), returned to Czechoslovakia, got out just before the Communists could get their hands on him and who, despite organised persecution by Leftist academics, became one of the leaders of anti-totalitarian intellectual life in post-war Australia.

Andrew Alexander wrote in the *Spectator* recently that the Cold War was a fraud. The logical thrust of his argument was that Soviet Communism was no threat and presumably should not have been resisted, since it could only have been resisted by either Cold War or Hot War. Apparently if the Red Army had reached the English Channel it would not have mattered since Russia had no navy. Later the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan merely to protect its 'buffer zone', apparently fearing invasion by Pakistan.

Anyone who has any doubts on that score is recommended to see *Dark Blue World*. Made by people who have the credentials of having actually suffered under Communism, it leaves not the slightest doubt that it was at least as foul as Nazism and the moral duty of decent human beings to oppose it to the death was, and remains, absolute. At the same time it is not one of those drab, hand-held-camera efforts: purely as a piece of cinema and setting aside the political context it is splendid and spectacular.

I am worried that this splendid film will be quietly sidelined by the cultural establishment because of its unflinching and authoritative depiction of the dark swinishness of Communism and of those who went along with it. Attacking it is not necessary: ignoring it is enough. After I saw it I telephoned everyone I knew who *might* see it, imploring them to do so. If after having seen it you agree with me, I hope you will do the same. □

Hal GP Colebatch writes from Australia



Deptford Pudding

One of Deptford's two contributions to the language (the other being the scarce Deptford Pink flower, *Dianthus Armeria*), this is a simple, traditional dessert, ideal for summer.

Some of Deptford's famous past residents and visitors, such as John Evelyn, Peter the Great, Sam Pepys, Horatio Nelson and Henry Williamson may well have eaten similar dishes.

Ingredients

6 slices of white bread, crusts removed
2 eggs, separated
2 oz sugar
Half-pint milk
Grated rind of a lemon
2 teaspoons lemon juice

Preparation

Set oven to 350F/180C/Gas Mark 4. Butter a one-pint or one-and-a-half pint ovenproof dish. Grate the bread to produce fine breadcrumbs. Beat the egg yolks, sugar and milk together in a bowl, then stir in the breadcrumbs, lemon rind and juice. Whisk the egg whites until they stand up in soft peaks and fold into the mixture, combining thoroughly. Turn into the dish and stand the dish in a roasting tin. Pour in hot water halfway up the side of the dish, and bake for 30-40 minutes, until well-risen, set and golden. Serve immediately with gin or plain cream (serves four).

A good alcoholic accompaniment would be a pudding wine like Penfolds Botrytis Semillon.

The Macpherson Report:
'Anti-racist' Hysteria and the
Sovietization of the United Kingdom



The Macpherson Report:
'Anti-racist' hysteria and the
Sovietization of the United
Kingdom

by Dr Frank Ellis

UK Price: £4.95 inc p&p
Overseas customers please add 50p

**The Camp
of the Saints**



by Jean
Raspail

The latest authorised English-language edition (Social Contract Press, Petoskey, Michigan, 1995, 316pp, pb) of Raspail's prophetic novel about the consequences of unlimited immigration – the destruction of the nations of Europe.


UK Price: £10.00, inc. p&p.
Overseas customers please add £1.00

**The Death
of the West**

– How dying
populations and
immigrant invasions
imperil our country
and civilization

by Patrick J Buchanan

UK Price: £16.95 inc. p&p)
(Europe: £17.95; Rest of World: £19.50)



To obtain the above titles
please write to:

**Right Now!, PO Box 2085,
London, W1A 5SX, UK.**

Cheques/Postal Orders/International Money
Orders payable to 'Right Now' please.
We recommend that correspondence is sent by
recorded delivery.

Right Now! – Subscription Form

Make sure that you get *Right Now!* every issue by completing the subscription form below. Cheques/Postal Orders/International Money Orders etc should be payable to 'Right Now!' Subscribers with accounts with UK banks may pay by completing the standing order mandate below. Please return the standing order form with the subscription form directly to *Right Now!*

Rates for one copy of the next SIX issues are as follows:

- ☐ **United Kingdom** – £11.00
- ☐ **Europe** – £13.00
- ☐ **Rest of world, air mail** – £17.00
- ☐ **Australia and New Zealand** – available directly from our Australian distributor. Six issue subscription A\$38.00. Enquiries to: PO Box 160, Bankstown, NSW 2200, Australia.
- ☐ **United States and Canada** – available directly from our North American distributor. Payment of US\$30.00 by US Postal/Money Order or US check, payable to 'Right Now!' should be sent to: 244 Fifth Avenue, Suite 223A, New York, NY 10001-7604, USA. (Enquiries to: right-now@mindspring.com) Anyone with a US address and who is willing to pay in US dollars (\$30 for six issues) may now pay by credit card on our secure website (www.right-now.org).

To: Right Now!, PO Box 2085, London, W1A 5SX, UK.

Please send me the next SIX issues of *Right Now!* starting with issue number ____.
I enclose payment of £_____

Name _____

Address _____

Postcode _____

If you wish to give us your telephone and/or e-mail address it will help us to keep you informed about any meetings and activities we are holding.

Telephone _____ E-Mail _____

DATA PROTECTION ACT Under the terms of the Data Protection Act 1998 (United Kingdom) you are advised that we hold our subscription details on a computer database. We do not make this database available to any other person, company or organisation. If you DO NOT WISH to receive any other mailings from *Right Now!* then please tick this box ☐.

STANDING ORDER MANDATE

To: The Manager of the below named Bank.

I, the undersigned, **HEREBY DIRECT** that you pay to the credit of **RIGHT NOW PRESS LIMITED** for the credit of its account (9136-3492) with HSBC Bank PLC at its Chancery Lane and Fleet Street Branch (Sort Code 40-02-07) the sum set out below as the "Amount" on the date of the receipt of this order by you and thereafter on the anniversary thereof in each succeeding year until you receive further notice from me in writing **AND** debit my account accordingly **AND** please quote the reference shown below when making payment to the HSBC Bank.

Bank _____ Bank PLC. Bank Sort Code _____

Branch Address _____

Postcode _____

Account Name: _____ Account No.: _____

Amount: the sum of _____ pounds only. In figures: £_____.00

Signed: _____ Date: ____/____/20____.

For office use only: Reference _____

Changing the cultural environment

Roderick Moore says that the free market offers the best hope of escape from the present hostile cultural milieu

In a democracy, the limits of political possibility depend on public opinion, which in turn depends on the cultural environment. As the editorial in *RN* 32 pointed out, today's cultural environment is dominated by an intellectual élite which believes in multiculturalism and permissiveness, so that conservatives and classical liberals who believe in patriotism and family life always find themselves fighting an uphill struggle. The problem includes television producers, film directors, musicians, playwrights, novelists, journalists and the members of university faculties, who all tend to be hostile to traditional values.

Instead of taking the cultural environment as given, we should consider how it is created and how it could be changed. Our aim should be to make sure that all cultural conflicts are fought on a level field where no one has an unfair advantage, so that we have at least a sporting chance of winning the war of ideas in defence of our values.

The crucial areas where the cultural war is being fought are education, the media and the arts. The main problem with many of the most important institutions in these areas is that they are state-controlled, so that we all have to pay for them through our taxes, whether or not we agree with the values that they are promoting. This applies to schools, universities, the BBC and the Arts Council. These institutions are the commanding heights of the cultural landscape, and whoever controls them can dominate other institutions, even those that are apparently independent of the state.

For example, although there is a free market in publishing, state control of higher education has repercussions on it, because companies which publish academic textbooks earn a large part of their profits by selling them to universities, and no company wants to risk offending its biggest customers. A more subtle but even more important influence is that the people who run the media have all learned their ideas at the same state-controlled schools and universities, even if the companies they work for are privately owned. Film, record and publishing companies may be hotbeds of political correctness simply because the people in charge of them have been brought up to take political correctness for granted, and they cannot imagine any other way of thinking. A further influence is that people employed by private companies may intend to move to state institutions at a later stage in their careers, so it is obviously unwise for them to say anything of which their future employers may disapprove.

When it comes to taking control of

cultural institutions, the *Guardian*-reading intellectual elite always has an advantage over ordinary people, because it is expert at manipulating the political process by pulling strings behind the scenes. *Guardian*-readers are usually more fanatical than other people and more willing to give up their spare time to take part in politics, which enables them to gain experience of the internal workings of the system. Joe Public, on the other hand, does not pay much attention to politics until it poses an immediate threat to his way of life, so when he does get involved, he finds himself up against skilful political operators who can easily outmanoeuvre him with the help of their inside knowledge.

"Privatisation of education would make Clause 28 unnecessary, because a free market would be a much more effective way of keeping homosexual propaganda out of schools"

However, controlling an institution is no good if you cannot raise the money to run it, which is where the free market comes in. In a free market, institutions have to ask the public politely for money, instead of demanding it through taxes. If you ask people for money when you have just sneered at their values, they are likely to tell you where to go. Another advantage of the free market is that it enables many different institutions to exist, all separately funded. In a free market, the *Guardian*-reading classes would have to hijack cultural institutions one at a time, instead of taking over all of them at once by hijacking the government agency that paid for them all. The important thing about the free market is that you do not have to be an expert at string-pulling and manipulation to get what you want; you just have to pay your money and take your choice. Even if you are dissatisfied with all existing institutions, you can always join forces with your friends and start a rival institution of your own.

Given the importance of education to culture, privatisation in this area should be our first priority. The idea of privatising schools and funding them through a voucher system has been widely discussed by free market economists for nearly 30 years. Sir Keith Joseph tried to introduce a scheme like this in the 1980s, but he failed because the civil service did a *Yes, Minister*. He was a talented man, but he would have been more at home in an academic environment than the rougher, tougher world of politics. A

more resolute politician might succeed where he could not. Privatising universities is another idea which has been talked about already. Some time before the last election, William Hague proposed that this should be carried out by giving each university a lump sum as an endowment and leaving them to raise all future revenue from private sources. I was never a great fan of Hague's, to put it mildly, but just for once he came up with a good idea.

Incidentally, privatisation of education would make Clause 28 unnecessary, because a free market would be a much more effective way of keeping homosexual propaganda out of schools. If parents did not approve of what a school was teaching, they would be free to transfer their children to another school, and any school which did not comply with their wishes would go out of business in five minutes flat – unlike state schools, which of course cannot go bankrupt. There would be no need for parents to go to the trouble of organising letter-writing campaigns to their MPs every time an unsympathetic government threatened to repeal Clause 28.

Where the arts are concerned, some people may object to private funding because they believe that the only alternative to state subsidies is commercial sponsorship, and they feel that commercial values have no place in the world of art. I think they are wrong. Private institutions do not necessarily have to be commercial or profit-making. For example, take the National Trust. It is a non-profit-making institution with an annual budget about the same size as the Arts Council's and it does some really excellent work in preserving historic buildings and some of our most beautiful countryside, but it is a private organisation funded entirely by voluntary donations and subscriptions from supporters, not by taxation. If the Arts Council was abolished, surely there is no reason why art-lovers could not set up organisations like the National Trust to support their favourite theatres, galleries and orchestras.

Of course, privatisation of education, television and the arts would not work miracles overnight, because in the short term they would still be run by the same bunch of *Guardian*-readers who run them now. Even so, it would still have a demoralising effect on these people if they knew that they could no longer depend on a steady income from the state, and every man and woman in the country was free to refuse to give them a penny more. They would probably respond by toning down their propaganda. In the longer term, it would become much easier for conservatives and classical liberals to follow a career in these fields, and then we would be well on the way to winning the cultural war. □

Roderick Moore writes from Liverpool

For a discussion of privatising the BBC, see Roderick Moore's article, 'Towards a Sounder BBC', published in *RN* 29 (October 2000).

PC CBBC

Jonathan Kaye says children's TV is more about indoctrination than information

My son and I sit down together and watch television when the weather is bad. Watching television might not be 'perfect parenting' but in small doses it can help the smooth running of a household. And if we hadn't sat down and watched mid-morning children's entertainment and schools' TV in particular, then I would never have known the extent of the propaganda beamed out to our little – and not so little – ones.

From this minor exposure I decided to do a random sampling of children's television. The nature of this propaganda is multiculturalism. I do not mean the inclusion in TV programmes of children and presenters of other races, but their completely unrepresentative and gratuitous inclusion – the sheer numbers and diversity of non-white children, adults, puppets and even cartoon characters in TV programmes.

This sampling began in November 2001 and lasted until the end of May 2002. Most of the programmes fell between 10am and noon, though others came from the 'afternoon slot' – 3.30pm to 5pm. The randomness of this sampling meant that my recorded viewing might stretch from no programmes watched to a run, say, of three.

Both Channel 4 (4 Learning) and BBC schools' programmes are on for two to two-and-a-half hours a day. I watched and recorded an hour of these programmes from either channel though I tended to concentrate on the BBC. Only a selection of the examples is listed below – just enough to hint at the many different ways in which multiculturalism is promoted on television. Programme presenters were generally ethnically diverse (eg, on 5th December 2001, there were two black presenters, one mixed-race presenter and one white presenter on BBC and ITV).

The ethnic mix for all the programmes I monitored over the period was as follows:

- * White 54%
- * Black 28.5%
- * Asian 10%
- * Asian Muslim (where apparent) 4%
- * Mixed race (where apparent) 2.5%
- * Oriental 1%

Throughout this exercise, on 4 Learning there was a 30-second countdown between its schools' programmes. Accompanying this countdown were shots of schoolchildren. Nearly every shot was exclusively of black or mixed-race children. A similar introduction to *Numbertime* on the BBC had 12 shots of white children and nine shots of black children.

Interludes between BBC programmes included *Clean Slate*, featuring a school choir, with a camera shot lingering on one white and one black child – this indicated the very


typical camera work, especially in classroom scenes. Typically both BBC and Channel 4 programmes made special use of inner-city schools.

During the period the BBC also ran a short feature depicting Africans and Asians cooking or working in fields. There were no similar features (I recorded) displaying English or British culture. Apart from the following specific examples, it is noteworthy that the BBC ran a regular citizenship programme with a black presenter portraying the plight of 'asylum-seekers' and refugees.

Some examples of programmes featuring sententious diversity included:

28th November 2001 *Come Outside* (BBC)
"Once upon a time there was a fire-fighter called Martha" (she was a black puppet)

29th November 2001 *Teletubbies* (BBC)
'Indian dance featuring Asian children with Birmingham accents



December 2001 *Words and Pictures* (BBC)
featured a female presenter and a black male storyteller. The story was an African/Caribbean tale. An animation of a black sea captain (with a Jamaican accent) was used to spell out words from the story

3rd December 2001 *Magic Key* (BBC) -
"Nadim's Machine" featuring the character Nadim Shah... (three white, two black and one Asian child shown)

7th December 2001 *Story-time* (BBC) with a
black woman and a white child, a black narrator of a story with two white adults

17th December 2001 *Teletubbies* (BBC) -
Asian child playing tabla

10th January 2002 *Focus: Growing Up - Puberty* (BBC). An Oriental model was chosen to show how to deal with periods. A discussion of breast growth was conducted with three Muslim girls (veiled) and two white girls. The music chosen was black

16th January 2002 *Words and Pictures* (BBC)
with a black presenter. In a cartoon of Jack and Jill, Jack was black with a range

of multi-ethnic children. An animation later carried the growing trend of yellow (but not Chinese) children

22nd January 2002 *English Express* (BBC)
"Meet the Author" – Malorie Blackman (a black woman)

16th April 2002 *Playdays* – black presenter

16th April 2002 *English Express* – poem recited with Jamaican accent and accompanied by a black painter. Craig Charles (mixed-race) performed a poem

16th April 2002 *Music Makers* – jazz music focusing on Afro-American composer Edward Ory

16th April 2002 *Zig Zag* – short film, "This is Kenya"

1st May 2002 *Focus* – Racism – featured Benjamin Zephaniah. Black presenter introduced three black children's stories of racism where white children were depicted as bullying and bigoted. The Stephen Lawrence case was 'discussed' – followed by details of the *Macpherson Report*. We were told that "Racism is a problem that won't go away" then given more examples of white-on-black racism. There was a film of white girls bullying a black girl, calling her "clay face" with "hands [the] colour of mud" and "dirt face". The white girls then sang a rather unlikely song that went, "We're white, we're poor, we're not going to hit rock bottom". The black presenter then discussed combating racism. Benjamin Zephaniah performed another of his poems. More examples of white on black 'racism' were shown – one of the black children said, "I don't hate white people, I'm proud of where I'm from."

3rd May 2002 – *Landmarks* – Pakistan and its people

And on and relentlessly on... I could have filled up pages with similar examples. I would wish to have been proved wrong with this sampling. Sadly, that was not the case. Although I accept that this is not a statistically valid survey, I have seen enough to know that the makers of children's TV programmes seem to feel constrained to insert politically correct messages into virtually everything they produce. Not only were white children discriminated against but also the nature of that discrimination was often insidious and cruel. Can it all have been coincidence that children of colour were placed at the front of classes or consistently picked out by camera crews? Are all white children the same? Is the only distinguishing feature in a class that between white and black or brown skin?

It seems those people who bleat on about 'equality' are themselves deeply racist. The truly sad thing is even if they were to have these facts shoved under their noses they would probably rather cry 'racist' at the compiler of this report. □

Jonathan Kaye writes from
Somerset

The Light's On at Signpost

George MacDonald Fraser, Harper Collins, London, 2002, 328pps, hb, £18.99

Reviewed by Arthur Deramore


George MacDonald Fraser is best known for his popular Flashman novels, but he has also had a long and successful career as a screenwriter, and the dust cover of this book describes it as "Memoirs of the movies, among other matters". The author himself says it is a mixed bag.

There are 32 chapters, of which 12 describe his screenwriting activities in Hollywood, Pinewood and Cinecitta. But it will be the ten chapters headed "Angry Old Man" that will be of most interest to readers of *Right Now!*

MacDonald Fraser is a 77 year old Cumbrian of Scottish ancestry and lives in the Isle of Man, which explains the choice of title. The last corner before the end of the 37 mile lap of the TT motorcycle races is called Signpost Corner, because there is a large grandstand and scoreboard alongside it. Each time a rider passes this on one of his six laps of the circuit a light flashes on the scoreboard and he knows how much further he has to go. When the sixth light flashes he knows he is close to the end of his race. Pessimistically, MacDonald Fraser reckons he is starting on his last lap. Explaining his reasons for writing the book, he says "There is something else I want to do, not just for myself, but for all those others, whose lights are on at Signpost, that huge majority of a generation, who think as I do, but whose voices, on the rare occasions when they are raised, are lost in the clamour of the new millennium". To the charge of presumption to speak for a generation, he says, "I can only retort that someone's got to, because nobody has yet, not in full, and if we're not careful we'll have all gone down the pipe without today's generation getting a chance not just to hear our point of view, but perhaps understand how and why we came to hold it".

The 12 chapters on his screenwriting days are accompanied by a number of photographs and contain many interesting reminiscences about famous film actors and actresses, directors and fellow writers. The Angry Old Man chapters, too, are written with verve and sincerity, which makes them more effective than many a serious tome by an economist or political pundit. This must be the most politically incorrect book to appear in the last 30 years, because MacDonald Fraser writes from the heart and is not afraid of ruffling feathers.

He writes, "To one of my generation, who remembers pre-war, wartime and post-war (as most of the present population and their governors do not) and who has travelled widely, the United Kingdom begins to look more and more like a Third World country



Books

"Reading maketh a full man" - Bacon

- shabby, littered, ugly, running down, without purpose or direction, misruled by a typical Third World government, corrupt, incompetent and undemocratic. My generation has seen the decay of ordinary morality, standards of decency, sportsmanship, politeness, respect for the law, the law itself, family values, politics, education and religion, the very character of the British".

Many septuagenarians, octogenarians and the few remaining nonagenarians have often asked themselves "How did it all go so wrong?", and said "I no longer recognise the country I was born in". MacDonald Fraser lays the blame squarely on a succession of post-war governments led by inadequate prime ministers. Margaret Thatcher is excluded from these, but of the rest he names Edward Heath and Tony Blair as the worst two premiers Britain has ever endured.

Heath took us into the EU on a false prospectus that it entailed "no significant loss of sovereignty", while knowing full well that he was signing Britain into the incipient European superstate. But bad as was Heath, Blair has proved far worse. He has signed both the Amsterdam and Nice treaties, whittling away the last vestiges of sovereignty, signed Britain up to the European Army, subsumed our centuries-old legal system to the European Court of Justice, devolved the United Kingdom by rigged referenda and virtually abolished England by seeking to have it divided into nine EU regions. He treats Parliament with contempt and has played havoc with our

constitution, while leading a government of unprecedented incompetence and corruption. Apart from domestic affairs, MacDonald Fraser is critical of Blair's policies in Kosovo, Afghanistan and Sierra Leone, and the hypocrisy of waging war against countries suspected of harbouring terrorists, while co-operating with Éire in a so-called peace process to appease Republican terrorists and leaving Mugabe to terrorise Zimbabweans. He charges Labour with dishonourable conduct in arresting General Pinochet when he was a guest of this country, saying it was a "failure to observe a code respected by the lowliest savage. Admit someone to your home, let him eat your metaphorical salt, and you are bound to treat him as a guest and see him safe". They have ensured that a saying once proverbial and honoured in Latin America would vanish forthwith, or be used only in sarcastic contempt - "The word of an Englishman". More controversial is his opinion of Germany and Japan, and this will meet charges of xenophobia. History, however, supports his argument.

Harper Collins deserves credit for publishing this book and, predictably, its production is impeccable. Its theme may be summed up in the author's own words: "How tragic, how degrading that the marvellous thing that was Britain, the wonder of the world, should after all the travail and suffering and heroism and sacrifice and sheer bloody genius of centuries, end with the shortest of whimpers, sold down the river by mere politicians, unworthy and third rate. And then it will be bye-bye Magna Carta, fare ye well Declaration of Arbroath, so long Bill of Rights and constitution. You were great while you lasted".

He may be criticised for being over-emotional and for describing the disease without suggesting a cure, but not for insincerity. And what if the disease is incurable? The more people, especially younger people, read this book and take on board its censure, the greater is the chance that the will for redemption will grow.

Lord Deramore is a Patron of *Right Now!*

Education and Institutional Racism

David Gillborn, Institute of Education, London, 2002, £3.00

Reviewed by Leslie Jones

For historian Frank Ellis, the 'anti-racist' hysteria that accompanied the *Macpherson Report* evoked the Stalinist era. It is an apt analogy, for Caucasians are the new Kulaks. Just as the latter were deemed guilty of anti-Soviet crimes by virtue of their class status, so all whites must be racist because of colonialism and slavery.

Having defamed and demoralised the

police, the 'anti-racist' zealots have turned their attention to the teachers. David Gillborn, a Professor at the Institute of Education, is vying to be to them what Sir William Macpherson was to the police – a scourge. For Gillborn contends that the poor academic performance of Afro-Caribbean children is due to "institutional racism".

Certain statistics speak volumes. The Youth Cohort Study shows that in the year 2000 only 37% of black students achieved five higher grade GCSEs compared to 50% of whites. Admittedly, a significant proportion of the former group attend schools in deprived areas. Yet these disparities cannot be explained in terms of socio-economic disadvantage alone. For Afro-Caribbean pupils from middle class homes are doing little better than are whites from manual backgrounds. Or as Linda S Gottfredson pithily observes apropos the USA, "rich blacks learn less than poorer whites".

Attainment aside, black boys have high rates of exclusion from school. And they are disproportionately represented in the lowest ability groups. Gillborn discerns here the pernicious influence of a pervasive stereotype, to wit, black students have limited ability, poor motivation and bad behaviour. He predicts that the recent proposals to reform the education of 14-19 year-olds, through the extension of specialisation, vocational education and setting by ability would therefore adversely affect black children.

However, Gillborn's indictment of an already beleaguered profession is based on just one study (his own) of teachers' attitudes towards black pupils carried out in two London schools. Moreover, R E Ferguson has shown that the expectations of American teachers are based on a pupil's past performance rather than race. Nor does Gillborn explain why, if prejudice is rife in education, some ethnic minorities are performing so well. In the year 2000, for example, the GCSE results of Indian pupils surpassed those of white pupils.

Professor Gillborn draws attention to the fact that in one large London educational authority Afro-Caribbean children had the highest levels of achievement at age five but subsequently the worst GCSE results. But in the United States, black-white gaps in reading and maths have been found before school entry and remain constant at all age levels. Likewise, a research paper published by the DfES refers to children's cognitive skills when assessed on entry into pre-school. It states that black African children had the second lowest mean score. Is it surprising, then, that the majority of behavioural scientists believe that genetic factors must be involved in the black-white IQ difference?

What exactly is intelligence? A statement published in the *Wall Street Journal* in 1994 described it as "a very general mental capacity". The 52 leading scholars who

endorsed this statement believe that intelligence, or *g* is a property of the brain that causes all cognitive abilities to be positively correlated. They maintain that *g* has high heritability. And they regard IQ tests as the best method of measuring the effects of *g* and thereby of predicting academic performance. So do the many British secondary schools that use cognitive assessment tests to sort children into sets.

According to Gillborn, however, intelligence is merely acquired skills and knowledge. It follows that mental tests only measure what the individual has learned so far. Those who do badly in such tests must have been denied the opportunity to acquire the requisite skills and knowledge. Every schoolboy carries in his pencil box a marshal's baton, to paraphrase Napoleon. Note, however, that this egalitarian theory of intelligence was the rationale for the abortive and costly pre-school and other compensatory programmes for deprived groups in the US, notably Head Start.

The author advocates systematic ethnic monitoring of levels of attainment. White teachers should have high expectations of black children. But in the United States this 'inclusive strategy', supplemented by innovative classroom procedures and attempts to enhance minority pupils' self-esteem, has not produced equality of educational outcomes.

'Institutional racism' is the current excuse for the comparative failure of black school children. Alienation, caste status, cumulative deficit, peer pressure, rap music, slavery, social discrimination, stereotype threat and white racism were the previous excuses. Yet where is the evidence that any of these hypothesised factors actually depress mental ability? As Arthur Jensen has aptly remarked, recent educational research is predominantly a parade of fads and illusions.

In *The Abilities of Man* (1927) the psychologist Charles Spearman observed that when white and black school children were given a battery of ten diverse tests, the amount of the W-B IQ difference on any particular test depended on the extent to which it required "the education of relations and correlates" (ie, complex thinking). Here, *contra* Gillborn, is the true starting point for understanding ethnic differences in attainment.

Dr Leslie Jones is an historian and author

The Political Economy of a Christian Society

Stephen C Perks, Kuyper Foundation, Taunton, 2001, 410 pages, pb, £14.95

Reviewed by Piers d'Arcy

Mr Perks' book could have been a lot better but, on the other hand, it could also have been a lot worse. Without wishing to be contradictory, one of the striking features of the book is its radicalism and, also, its

lack of it.

Perks exhibits an undue deference to the 'free market' economics which owe more to Adam Smith than Jesus Christ. This might be acceptable if he were defending this particular form of economics. But he claims to be arguing for a Christian model. In the circumstances, one would have thought that Perks could have dedicated some space to discussing a radical alternative to capitalism. For example, has no Christian economist anything to say about the Mondragon experiment in Spain, which is based on the co-operative principles of the Rochdale pioneers? Its success seems to lie in building up the esteem of the workers, who are also owners of the means of production and investors in the company. Perks hasn't anything to say about this. Instead, he treats us to a diet of *laissez-faire* economics parading as a Christian view of economic activity. He seems to assume that a genuinely 'free market' economy trickles down wealth and, therefore, the redistribution of wealth (the socialist panacea) is unnecessary. This is a contentious point and his argument is tenuous.

Fortunately, the book is also furnished with more refreshing insights. He rejects socialism as an acceptable economic model. There is a good scriptural evaluation of socialism. He makes several pertinent points. One of these is that there are no biblical texts that require people to take seriously a "radical programme of wealth distribution". The injunction to help the poor is clear, but this does not entail a "state-enforced wealth distribution" programme. A further corollary of the appeal to individuals to help the poor is that the Bible does not, seemingly, require the state to administer charity. Besides, "private charities are more effective in screening out spongers". More power to his elbow on this point.

What he fails to realise, though, is that there are more similarities between socialism and the beloved capitalist system that he espouses so forcibly. They are not, as he claims, "diametrically opposed" systems. One could also argue that socialism, in practical terms, leads to the economic control of the few over the many. Is this not also a characteristic of global capitalism?

There is better to come, not least a rejection of the EU. *Right Now!* readers will be pleased to learn that Perks views the EU as a "farce, perhaps even a tragic farce" and believes that our beloved politicians "are about to sell our birthright for a mess of European pottage". But haven't they partially done so already?

More controversially, Perks takes an in-depth look at the so-called "money question". I liked this particular section and agree with his assertion that the banks regularly perpetrate fraud by literally

Continued overleaf ➤

growing money on trees. This is facilitated by the fractional reserve system, which enables financial institutions to lend more than they actually have. Unfortunately, his fine analysis is rather spoilt by a call for the abolition of the Royal Mint. The pretext for this is that "the history of government monopoly of coinage is a history of debasement and fraud". To a certain extent this may be true. However, Perks' proposed solution, of "free coinage", is eccentric.

There are many other and good aspects of the book – the proposal for the privatisation of 'welfare', in order to reduce bureaucracy and waste, being one of them. But I cannot understand his prejudice against the medieval schoolmen and their attempts to adopt certain aspects of Aristotelian philosophy.

In short, better books have been, and will be, written about this subject. Nevertheless, this is a largely constructive contribution to what is a rather specialised debate.

Piers d'Arcy writes from Kent

Is a Mast a Must?

Barry Bracewell-Milnes, Book Guild, Lewes, 2001, 130pps, hb, £12.95

Reviewed by Derek Turner

Despite its somewhat unpromising title, this is a surprisingly engaging and useful work. In the accompanying press release, we are told that *RN* readers are likely to be "greatly interested in the fascinating tale of the author's experiences in campaigning against the placing of a potentially hazardous telecommunications mast". This might sound like an Alan Partridge-style joke, but Barry Bracewell-Milnes, a renowned taxation expert and influential author, is no Charles Pooter.

Mr Bracewell-Milnes lives in Banstead. In March 1999, he learned that the mobile phone company Vodafone was planning to erect a mast close to his own property. He promptly decided that he did not want such an eyesore near his property, with the rumoured health risks, and the certain fall in the value of his property. He immediately launched a vigorous campaign to see off this threat. In the end, and against the odds, he was successful.

He peppers the book with exasperatedly humorous asides – "Caligula was reported to have wished that the people of Rome had only one neck, so that he could cut off the head once and for all; a Roman Residents' Association could have been the answer to his prayers" – and cutting remarks – "Ninety-nine percent of politicians give the others a bad name".

But this is much more than a mere case study. It is also an object lesson in how to run a successful local campaign and defeat officialdom, and a lucidly-argued case for

legislative change in relation to the erection of such structures. The subtitle, "How to fight off intruders", is what this book is really all about. In writing this book, and taking up this unfashionable, slightly tedious cause, Mr Bracewell-Milnes is doing a public service – helping ordinary people have a greater say over their local environments, protecting the landscape, energising local government and thwarting the greed and shortsightedness of some companies. This is a point understood by some within the environmental movement who urge people to "think globally, act locally" – although most environmental pressure groups are strangely silent on the subject of telephone masts.

In a world riven by disaster and tragedy, this proposed mast may have been a small matter but, as the author says: "A fight against what is wrong and unacceptable may still be worth fighting, even if it is a small fight, and especially if it is winnable". His insights and his commonsense tips are now at the service of everyone who believes in local democracy, and desires a saner world.

Derek Turner is the editor of *Right Now!*

The Betrayal of British Ulster

Andrew Hunter MP, Friends of the Union, London, 2002, 22pps, pb, £5.00

Reviewed by Allan Robertson

Andrew Hunter delivered the 11th Ian Gow Memorial Lecture in two separate venues during November 2001, one in Belfast and one in London. This pamphlet is based on those two addresses. Andrew Hunter has been among the very few Conservative MPs who have consistently opposed the Belfast Agreement, along with Laurence Robertson and David Wilshire. The title of the lectures is deliberately unambiguous. The betrayal began with the Downing Street Declaration in December 1993, although it had its origins further back. The lectures were analytical and reflective in tone and did not deal with up to the minute political developments in Northern Ireland.

Hunter is critical of Unionists for taking mainland support for granted throughout much of the 20th Century. During the 1912-1914 crisis, the backing received from Bonar Law was crucial, as was support from the upper echelons of the army. However, in recent times the Conservative leadership has been ambiguous in its support for British Ulster and, in this reviewer's opinion, the upper echelons of the army have become more politicised and ergo more 'pragmatic'. General Glover's remarks in the 1980s that we could never defeat terrorism in Northern Ireland were seen by many as correct, whereas they were merely defeatist and unpatriotic.

The always powerful lobby to dispose of Ulster has gained strength since the departure of Mrs Thatcher from office in

1990. While Mrs Thatcher was misled into signing the Anglo-Irish Agreement, her "No, No, No!" to the Anglo-Irish Forum proposals of 1984 was sincere. However, in the early years of John Major's premiership, secret channels of negotiation with the IRA were reopened and the 1993 Downing Street Declaration said that Britain had no selfish, strategic or economic interests in the Union with Northern Ireland. The Conservative government had abandoned any commitment to act positively for the Union. In fact, by 1992 the British government had developed a selfish economic and strategic reason for abandoning Northern Ireland. The IRA's Baltic Exchange bomb cost £800m in damages. This was followed by other attacks on the City in 1993, Heathrow in 1994 and London's Docklands in early 1996. Hunter argues that the IRA won its armed struggle on 10th April 1992, when they blew up the Baltic Exchange and bombed their way to the negotiating table. The other bombs could be seen as 'reminders' to keep up the pressure on the government.

Hunter goes on to review the significance of the framework document of 1995, which he then viewed as a clever trap for Unionists. Unionists rejected this framework document, yet it formed the basis of the 1998 Belfast Agreement. Hunter argues that the Irish government never dropped its territorial claim on Ulster. He quotes Bertie Ahern saying in the *Dail* on 21st April 1998 that they were merely "reformulating Articles 2 and 3 of the 1937 constitution, not territorially disembodying the Irish nation". In fact, the Agreement incorporates the core mythology of Irish nationalism: that there is a single nation and people on the island of Ireland, with a right of self-government.

Hunter demolishes any arguments relating to the supposed benefits of the Ulster Assembly, and deals with the many illusions surrounding the principle of 'consent'. He writes that "the Assembly has been designed not to underpin the Union but to create and facilitate a cross-border dynamic" and that the key to understanding Labour's strategy in Ulster is a 1988 document called *Towards a United Ireland: Reform and harmonisation – A dual strategy for Irish unification*, two of whose authors were Mo Mowlam and Kevin MacNamara. The authors lament the fact that the Conservatives did not pay enough attention to this policy document. The Belfast Agreement merely provides the mechanism for implementing the strategy Labour devised back in 1998.

Andrew Hunter is an able persuader for the Union, and his booklet may alert minds in the Conservative shadow cabinet to the dangers that lie ahead in Ulster.

The Betrayal of British Ulster is available from Friends of the Union, PO Box 1261, London SW3 4JF.

Allan Robertson is Chairman of the London Swinton Circle and a contributing editor, *Right Now!*

The Socialist Workers' Party – eccentric apologists for evil

Andrew Cassidy dissects the SWP's anti-war rationale

In the immediate aftermath of the September 11th attacks on America, global and domestic politics became polarised between those supporting American/British military action and those opposing it. Predictably, the far Left – in particular, the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) – became the most vocal members of the 'anti-war' lobby.

The SWP was instrumental in forming the Stop the War Coalition (STWC), which is now essentially an SWP front group with only limited participation from other organisations (such as the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and the Green Party). Several of the larger STWC rallies (eg, 13th October and 18th November 2001 and 2nd March 2002) in central London have attracted sizeable support, although it has been largely limited to the 'usual suspects' that annually fill the streets during the May Day riots. As has been noted elsewhere, the presence of Tony Benn at a STWC demo doesn't necessarily indicate mass public support for the cause. The STWC is now planning a 'No to war in Iraq' rally in September to coincide with the first anniversary of the launch of Operation Enduring Freedom – although not even the SWP has the audacity to organise the rally for September 11th.

Importantly, the STWC's activities are largely organised outside the structure of the Socialist Alliance, the loose grouping of far Left parties that has set out its stall as a Leftwing alternative to New Labour and is challenging Labour's position within the trade union movement, and which includes the SWP. Naturally, this has led to friction within the Alliance. It is apparent that the SWP's role in the STWC is to use it as a Trojan horse for its own anti-American agenda. The STWC allows the SWP to recruit new members, capitalise on the huge media interest that the war on terrorism has created and gives its party 'intellectuals' (eg, Paul Foot) the opportunity to write yet more sanctimonious Marxist drivel in the *Guardian*.

The SWP's hostility to military action in Afghanistan has won it the rather unfortunate reputation in some quarters of being an apologist for both the Taliban and Al Qaeda. SWP intellectuals and apparatchiks such as Lyndsey German (editor of the party's *Socialist Review* magazine), John Rees (editor of the *International Socialist*) and Hassan Mahamdallie have frequently criticised Western foreign policy towards Afghanistan (and the conduct of the war) in a manner both venomous and almost farcically inaccurate.

Essentially, the SWP's opposition to the

war on terror centres on the following simplistic assertions and crackpot conspiracy theories. First, the war in Afghanistan is a militarist plot by NATO (ie, George Bush and Tony Blair) and Rightwing hawks in the US Congress, the CIA, Labour cabinet ministers such as Jack Straw and Ben Bradshaw, global capitalism, the free market, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the G8 of nations, Freemasons, McDonalds, Nike, Starbucks, BP, Shell, Esso and Microsoft and slimy green aliens from the planet Zarg.

Secondly, the US and UK-led coalition aims to murder and maim most Afghan civilians out of sheer bloodlust and keep the remainder living in abject poverty. (As one SWP activist said at the STWC meeting in November last year "The Western forces are deliberately targeting Afghan civilians by using 'daisy cutter' bombs disguised as Red Cross food parcels".)

Thirdly, the SWP believes that oil is the primary concern for the Western leaders rather than any desire to eradicate vicious terrorists or liberate Afghanistan from a fundamentalist regime that had scant regard for human life, a terrible record on human rights, that favoured medieval-style discrimination against women and profited from the sale of heroin in the West through opium production. And so on. I could continue describing the SWP's inane rationale but I think *RN* readers will be able to fill in the gaps.


The politics of the SWP and its allies defy logic in most respects. In particular, their idea that Tony Blair has some sadistic desire to bomb Afghan children will sound far-fetched to most of us. It is likewise bizarre and perverse to argue, for instance, that those who advocated military action in Afghanistan did so to perpetuate the miserable conditions that have blighted Afghanistan for the last two decades. The SWP should ask itself why billions in international humanitarian aid funding is now being poured into the country to rebuild the country's infrastructure and provide some measure of hope – hope, it must be admitted, that isn't being offered by many of the warlords and armed thugs within the Northern Alliance.

Most *RN* readers, I'm sure, appreciate that spending billions on the war on terrorism (whilst the NHS is crumbling) and risking British soldiers' lives are not long-term solutions. But the majority of readers would probably also agree that an international effort to combat global terrorism and maintain Western security from rogue states (like Iraq) is sadly necessary.

As conflict with Saddam Hussein looks increasingly likely, we need to tackle these far Left myths head-on. We need to reassure those who might hearken to groups like the SWP that the West's actions are motivated not just by a desire to protect itself against terrorism, but also by the plight of innocent Iraqis who suffer directly as a result of Saddam's dictatorship (rather than economic sanctions – it is Saddam Hussein, not the West, who allows thousands of Iraqi children to die every year from curable diseases).

If we fail to respond robustly and clearly to the wilful falsehoods of groups like the SWP, it could be disastrous not only for the West – which needs to ensure the safety of its peoples – but also for the hungry people of Afghanistan, the sick people of Iraq and everyone who believes in civilised values and freedom. □

Andrew Cassidy is a politics graduate and writes from Essex



Back issues of *Right Now!* are available for £1 per copy, including post and packing. Please send cheques, postal orders or international money orders, payable to 'Right Now!', to:

Right Now! PO Box 2085,
London, W1A 5SX.

Issues 1 to 22: Sold out.

Issue 23: (April-June 1999) Interviews: RWF Poole and Hans Janitschek, conflict in Ulster and the Balkans, art, architecture and feminism.

Issues 24 to 26: Sold out.

Issue 27: (April-June 2000) Interviews: Nikolai Tolstoy and the Earl of Burford, the forgotten victims of communism, reflections of an old fogey, Tony's cronies, dispatch from Austria

Issue 28: (July-September 2000) Interviews: Robin Page and Dieter Stein, Russia's media war in Chechnya, Hilaire Belloc, decadence and renewal at American universities

Issue 29: Sold out.

Issue 30: (January-March 2001) Interviews: Antony Flew and Vladimir Bukovsky, economic fallacies about immigration, *The Parekh Report*, a new perspective on Australia.

Issue 31: (April-June 2001) Interviews: Christopher Gill and Samuel Francis, Robin Page on the rural disaster, more 'anti-racist' nonsense, the Which Blair Project.

Issue 32: (July-September 2001) Interview: Valerie Riches, Adrian Davies on the 'far Right', the 'new eugenics', an English parliament?

Issue 33: Sold Out

Issue 34: (January-March 2002) The coming confrontation with Islam, foot & mouth disease: a view from the Borders, whatever happened to the Protestant work ethic?

Issue 35: (April-June 2002) Pat Buchanan and Dwight Murphey on *The Death of the West*, Islam in Britain, General Walter Walker, education and ethnicity

EUROPE'S FASCIST MENACE

France and Holland have shown the very real danger posed by Europe's anti-democratic fascists. The hysterical attempts to intimidate French voters from supporting the democratic patriot Jean-Marie Le Pen, leader of the Front National (FN), and the murder of Dutch anti-immigration politician Pim Fortuyn, are the hallmarks of today's fascists who masquerade as 'liberals' but in reality are rabidly opposed to anyone who resists their brainwashing and insists on his right to his own opinions.

Rather than debate serious issues in an intelligent and reasonable fashion the liberal fascists will instead seek to smear you with words such as racist, sexist or Nazi. While meaningless, these words are nevertheless designed to invoke a Pavlovian reaction in a populace indoctrinated with the liberal fascist tenets. Fortuyn's assassination shows just where such tactics inevitably lead.

In France, Le Pen's success in getting to the second round of the presidential election resulted in organised demonstrations, with schoolchildren instructed by their teachers to join leftwing street protests. In addition to this physical intimidation, religious leaders, sports stars and celebrities of every kind were dragooned into a campaign of psychological intimidation and brainwashing to dissuade the people from supporting Le Pen. In the circumstances, he did remarkably well to poll over 5.5 million votes in the second round – 18% of the vote and a slight increase on his first round tally. The subsequent drop in the FN's vote to 11.25% in the parliamentary elections was, according to independent commentators, due partly to a high abstention rate among FN supporters (due both to a low-key campaign by Le Pen and an electoral system which prevented FN candidates being elected), and the desire to give the 'conservative' President Chirac a strong parliamentary majority after years of deadlock between him and the previous Socialist government. Although a temporary setback for the FN, the fact is that Chirac and the conservative Right now have no excuses for not tackling, as they have promised, the problems of crime and immigration which so concern the public. Their inevitable failure will allow the FN to campaign next time on the basis that only they can be trusted to solve these problems.

There is an interesting consistency in the votes the populist Right is currently achieving in Europe, with around 20% of the public willing to support a sensibly nationalistic party, rising to around 30% where the party is well-run and well-established or where the problems caused by immigration are particularly acute. Apart from Le Pen's 18% and the late Fortuyn's 17%, there is the 19% achieved by Ronald



"How few men are strong enough to stand against the prevailing currents of opinion ... Be prepared to stand up faithfully for Right and Truth, however the wind may blow"

Winston Churchill

Schill in Hamburg, the Swiss People's Party's 23%, Norway's Progress Party's 15% and the 18% achieved by the Danish People's Party. At the higher end of the scale we have the 27% achieved by Haider's Freedom Party in Austria, the Vlaams Blok's 33% in Antwerp, and Fortuyn's 30% in Rotterdam. Despite the occasional fluctuations inevitable in politics, the populist Right has never been so – well – popular.

Even in Britain, where the radical right has traditionally been weakest, there have been stirrings. *The Times* recently reported that only 19% of 15-19 year-olds welcomed asylum-seekers (compared to 26% of adults), and another poll found that 22% of Britons would support a party committed to withdrawal from the EU and with "far-reaching" anti-immigration policies, and that only 9% of voters think that 'mainstream' politicians do enough to address the public's concerns about immigration. The notion, so smugly espoused by our liberal rulers, that British voters are very different to their continental brethren and would never tread the path of populism is thus shown to be wholly wrong. There is – as those on the Right have always maintained – an electorate out there if only a sensible and credible nationalist party would come along to harness it.

And wouldn't you know it, just like the

buses, you wait for ages and suddenly two arrive at once. The May local elections in England saw the birth of the Freedom Party, a moderate, populist party which, standing in one 'test' ward, won almost a quarter of the vote. Although small, as all new-borns are, it is well run and we wait to see its long-term growth prospects with interest.

The British National Party, led by Nick Griffin, has also adopted a more measured approach and has begun to reap the rewards. Although a major breakthrough in themselves, the three council seats it won in Burnley actually understate the votes the BNP gained, with regular 25-35% poll shares in Burnley and Oldham where it concentrated its campaigning resources. It can therefore be seen that the BNP's results are consistent with those of the populist Right across Europe.

It is imperative for these parties not to fall into the 'Millwall trap' and allow themselves to be defined by their opponents, and seek succour in the camaraderie of the defiant minority. Patriotic right-wing parties are not 'extremists'; they are moderate and sensible, represent the views of the majority – and should say so, loudly. Although the mainstream media will, for the present, regularly misreport and misrepresent Right-wing parties, they should not be presented with any open goals: candidates, for example, must not have too many skeletons in their closets. Their whole approach, whether with the media or the public, must be positive, saying what they are for, rather than what they oppose; and it must be good-humoured, not bitter or angry.

So what of the future? The first thing we can expect is for the establishment parties to try to reassure the public that they will deal with crime and immigration. This has already happened in France and at the European summit in Spain. By seeming to take decisive action on these issues the politicians will hope to head off the voters at the pass and prevent them from backing populist parties. While this might work for a while, depending on the credibility of the policies proposed, liberals will never be able to take the firm action necessary and eventually the public will see through them and move to the radical Right in even larger numbers.

In those countries where proportional representation ensures that the populist Right is represented in parliament, establishment parties will initially try to exclude the Right, even forming all-party coalitions against them. Being excluded from government, far from dampening the support the Right receives, will increase it, as they are the only ones who cannot be held responsible for the government's shortcomings. Eventually, the weight of the Right's public support and the failure of the policy of exclusion will prevail, and the Right will be, grudgingly, invited to join a coalition government. My advice, then, would be

simple: *don't*. It was US President Lyndon B Johnson who said of FBI Director J Edgar Hoover, "it's better to have him inside the tent pissing out, than outside the tent, pissing in". If you are in government you can no longer criticise it convincingly, and as a junior party you will not be able to control it either. While being part of government, after years in the apparent wilderness, may seem attractive, you will have responsibility without power, the worst position to be in, and your support will fall – as has happened with the Freedom Party in Austria. The best tactic is to remain outside while influencing government policy (just as the Danish People's Party is doing) and trying to increase your support until you are in the position to be the major party of a government coalition.

Although some may criticise both Le Pen and Griffin for some of the things they have said or done in the past, the recent successes of the FN and the BNP compared to the public's disenchantment with the establishment parties shows that, in the land of the blind, truly, the one-eyed man is king.

GO FORTH AND MULTIPLY?

While Pat Buchanan's book *The Death of the West* has much to commend it and is well worth reading, I must take issue with one of his theses, which is that the low birthrate of whites is in itself a problem. The idea that declining birthrates will mean that we have to import foreign workers in order to support us when we retire is dangerous nonsense, as evidenced by the fact that the government is using just such an argument to justify the admission of thousands of Third World migrants. A problem could, admittedly, exist if we relied simply on taxation in order to pay for pensions, but if pensions are paid from investments which individuals have built up during their working lives then the problem is greatly lessened. The government should, therefore, encourage everyone to invest for their own pensions. Having done this, the notion that we must increase the working age population collapses.

The truth is that Europe's population is at an historical high and a reduction would be welcome. Lower government income from personal taxation would be offset by reduced demand on services such as education and welfare. Unemployment levels show there is no labour shortage, and if there were, mechanisation would increase in response. A lower population would mean less pressure to build houses on green land, less transport congestion, and less crime. The fact that whites, as a proportion of the world population, will fall is not in itself a problem. We don't need 60 million people in order to be successful as a nation: as recently as the 1920s, with a population of only 44 million, Britain controlled a

worldwide empire. We do not need to engage in a procreation race with blacks and Asians, a race we will never win – we simply need to keep more of them out of our countries.

AN ISSUE OF NO INTEREST

In recent issues I have discussed sex and drugs and rock and roll, so now let me come to that other essential ingredient of a happy life: money. Most people love money, but couldn't care less about the details of monetary policy... unless, of course, they live in Argentina. Argentina has, for some time now, been in the throes of a financial crisis, with people unable even to withdraw their own money from their bank. Why, you may wonder, should a bank have difficulty in simply returning the money which has been deposited with them?

The answer, of course, is that they have loaned it out, and not just once but several times over. They are able to do this because much of the money borrowed is spent in the form of cheques or credit card payments, which means that the bank does not actually have to part with any money but simply engages in an accounting exercise with another bank – or better still internally if the cheque is paid into the account of another of the bank's customers.

It is an astonishing – and from a British perspective, alarming – statistic that, whereas in 1948 50% of our money supply was made up of notes and coins, the figure today is a mere 3%. The other 97% is bank-created money. Don't cry for Argentina – we could be next!

IQ LOW DOWN

A national IQ test undertaken by the BBC in May and involving about 100,000 people came up with the result that men's IQ is, allegedly, seven points higher on average than that of women.

More revealing was the fact that the following day's papers almost universally censored this finding, preferring to report the statistically insignificant one or two point differences between people based on their hair or eye colour. Another curious feature of the BBC test was that although they categorised participants by such trivial matters as their height, star sign and the football team they support, the elephant in the room which wasn't mentioned was race. Is it really credible that this was omitted by accident or is it more likely that, knowing what the result would be, the BBC didn't have the courage and integrity to honestly investigate and report the facts?

johnbull@englandmail.com



WINDS OF CHANGE

New thinking on race

★ "The wretched of the earth...are demanding a more equitable distribution of the globe's resources; above all, they are demanding the right to settle here, in our affluent and not over-populated continent...Though the Seville summit discussed the topic, it did so in muddle and confusion, ending in a blend of liberal guilt, opportunism and gesture politics. It showed none of the clarity and hard thinking which the situation requires. No one insisted on the fundamental point: that we can only defend our own values, freedoms, prosperity and way of life if we reject most of the claims of the world's poor" – conservative columnist Bruce Anderson, writing in the *Independent* on 24th June 2002. He added "The practical case against uncontrolled immigration is overwhelmingly strong" and "Mass migration is like mass tourism; it risks destroying that which it seeks".

★ "Instead of wringing their hands over the excoriated rise of the Right in Europe, our liberal establishment should ponder how far the wrong-headed doctrine preached about multiculturalism for half a century has contributed to this trend. This requires nations to accept that, all cultures being equal, every immigrant is free to go their own way, to do his own thing – asking the immigrant to accept the values of the host country and conform to its ways is thus aggressive and unjust" – Lord (Bill) Deedes, *Daily Telegraph*, 20th May 2002 (after decades of silence on the subjects of immigration and multiculturalism whilst a Conservative MP and government minister, and editor of the *Daily Telegraph*).

★ In June, it was announced that Sir Andrew Green, a former diplomat, has set up the country's first pressure group against large-scale immigration. Migration Watch UK (www.migrationwatchuk.org) aims to raise awareness about the shortcomings of the immigration system, and the consequences of the present very high levels of immigration.

"The main concern is the sheer scale of immigration to the UK, which will bring in at least two million people over the next ten years, including a low estimate for the illegals", said Sir Andrew. "We are concerned about what it may portend for our society as a whole...It's not racism, it's realism".

One of Migration Watch's first papers highlights the economic costs, such as reducing the wages of native workers and pushing up unemployment. There are infrastructural implications, too – for example, the Greater London Authority estimates that 130 schools will need to be built in the ten years for the children of immigrants.

Sir,
Your editorial in *RN* 35 was not quite up to your usual standard. Saddam Hussein is now giving US\$25,000 to the families of every Palestinian suicide bomber. If he is an ally of the West, I'm the Queen of Sheba.

Apart from that, I would like to make two points about Iraq. The first one is about its military capabilities. In 1991, we routed the Iraqi army in five days. Is there any reason to believe it would do any better this time? And how many chemical or biological missiles could Iraq fire before we captured or bombed the launching sites? Surely defeating Iraq should not be all that difficult. Unlike Afghanistan, it consists mainly of low-lying plains, and its only mountainous area is inhabited by the Kurds, who are already in rebellion.

This brings me to my second point. Many of the illegal immigrants who are invading Britain through the Channel Tunnel are Kurds. If they had an independent homeland of their own, it would be in their interests as well as ours. I accept that Kurds are no saints, but independence for Iraqi Kurdistan would be the lesser of two evils. If we deposed Saddam Hussein, we could achieve it.


**Roderick Moore,
Liverpool**

Sir,
I must take issue with Rebecca Haynes's description of Huntingdon Life Sciences as an institution notorious for its cruel, sadistic, vivisection experiments on animals.

People who are opposed to animal experimentation always use the word 'vivisection', with its connotation of dissecting live animals, whereas very few animal experiments involve such a procedure.

Huntingdon Life Sciences is a contract research laboratory – that is to say, it undertakes experiments that pharmaceutical companies request of it. They, in turn, need to have the results of such experiments in order to comply with legislation imposed on them by

*"It is by benefit of letters that
absent friends are, in a manner,
brought together."*
— Seneca



Write to: The Editor, *Right NOW!*
PO Box 2085, London, W1A 5SX
or E-mail: rightnow@compuserve.com

The Editor regrets that he cannot answer all correspondence

various governments. The experiments are carried out according to strict protocols designed to elicit the information that the pharmaceutical companies need. There is no question of Huntingdon Life Sciences deviating from the protocols in order to be particularly sadistic or cruel. Furthermore, all experiments are conducted in such a way as to use the minimum number of animals consistent with obtaining scientifically valid results.

The experiments are overseen by Home Office inspectors, whose task it is to ensure that animal suffering is kept to a minimum. In addition, all experiments are subject to the more close control of the official veterinary surgeon, who is experienced in the welfare of laboratory animals and who can compel the company to cease an experiment forthwith.

Many diseases that were previously untreatable can now be cured as a result of animal experimentation. It is the opponents of animal experimentation, who would condemn many humans to suffer and die from diseases that would otherwise yield to scientific investigation some time in the future, who are the sadists.

**Dr P Lane,
Milton Keynes, Bucks**

Sir,

Yet again we are being told that we need immigrants for economic reasons.

The argument runs that with an ageing population we need able-bodied workers. When Lloyd George introduced the old age pension it was for men at the age of 70. The NHS and

better living conditions, not to mention the dramatic reduction of hard manual labour by the use of machines means that we could add millions of productive workers by simply raising the retiring age. This is not done today because notoriously those thrown on the labour market above the age of 50 have problems getting work – extending retirement would simply shift bodies from the retired to the unemployed columns in the statistics.

What we are short of is not workers, it is of cut-price labour willing to exist six to a room, the only way the poorly paid can afford to live near our city centres. Immigrants do this in order to get a foothold, but once this is achieved they bring in families, leave their badly paid mainly public sector jobs, and enter the housing market, thereby making things worse for the next wave who come to take their place.

Fifty years ago the London commuting belt ran mainly to Maidenhead and Slough to the west, and Brentwood and Chelmsford to the east. Housing costs meant that postmen, hospital porters, cleaners etc were in short supply, the main source being immigrants. Half a century on, after wave after immigrant wave, we still have an inner city labour shortage, but now even highly skilled doctors, teachers and computer experts cannot afford to live in the area and the commuter belt extends past Bristol and Norwich.

This continuous influx has not only brought us no lasting benefit, but arguably the rise in land prices and the increased congestion in our transport system, has, particularly in the South East,

put up our manufacturing costs to the detriment of our overall economic position.

One cannot of course blame those who have entered the country legally for this. They were morally entitled to accept the invitations of successive governments, but enough is enough. When you're in a hole, stop digging. Pay inner city workers a proper rate; it's cheaper than a never-ending succession of short term fixes which in the long term add to the problem.

**Gordon Haines,
Woodbridge, Suffolk**

Sir,

Much of the debate about the inherent dangers of referendum campaigns has concentrated on the likely damage to the No campaign of fragmentation and ideological sectarianism. The fact that so many groups co-exist and intend to play their part in the campaign is, however, an asset which the Europhiles do not possess. The Yes campaign is narrowly based and comprises a motley collection of corporatists, socialists, anti-Americans, bureaucrats and regulators.

Supporters of the single currency fail to command the universal support of any single group or body of opinion. The No campaign's strength lies in its diversity, as the successful Irish and Danish referendums illustrate.

The democratic deficit at the heart of European federalism explains why many who might normally be expected to support an anti-competitive, protectionist project cannot bring themselves to do so. All credit is due to those whose political inclinations are to support federalism but are not prepared to eliminate democracy. The enemies of diversity, independence and freedom can be found exclusively within the Yes campaign and this remains the strongest card in the No camp's pack. It is a message that must be played at every opportunity as we unite around a shared belief in common democratic principles.

**Philip Duly,
Campaign Manager
The Freedom Association
Bridgnorth, Shropshire**

FLANDERS: On 3rd March, at their 12th biannual conference under the rubric "Towards a different Europe", the youth section of the Vlaams Blok (Vlaams Blok Jongeren) elected a new leadership team under Frederic Erens, 33. The congress passed 13 resolutions, condemning multiculturalism and the Leftwing emphasis on rights rather than responsibilities, supporting the family and deploring the curbs on free speech caused by political correctness, amongst other resolutions. The congress rejected plans to include Turkey as a member of the European Union, but passed resolutions favouring a larger, looser Europe, united by idealism and civilizational self-awareness, rather than "pseudo-nationalism".

Internet: www.vbj.org

FRANCE: The astonishing success of Jean-Marie Le Pen, leader of the Front National, in reaching the second round of the presidential elections sent shockwaves through the entire European political establishment. With 17.1%, against the incumbent Chirac's 19.9%, not only had Le Pen brought about Prime Minister Lionel Jospin's political demise but he had posted notice in the most emphatic manner that the nationalist movement in France was in the ascendant. Amongst manual workers throughout the country, Le Pen topped the poll. He was also top in nine of the country's 22 regions and in 35 metropolitan departments. Interestingly, he polled 15.5% among university students. The FN's strongest support came from the east of the country, but encompassed a wide variety of areas, from Marseilles, with its high Muslim population, to industrially depressed cities like Calais, via prosperous Provence.

The second round of campaigning witnessed a disgraceful media operation to blacken Le Pen's name. The Left, far Left and the so-called 'moderate Right' went into overdrive. The most appalling lies were paraded in the press, including some thoroughly sordid journalism in Britain, to try and keep Le Pen out of the Elyseé. A press conference in the European Parliament (Le Pen is an MEP) had to be cancelled after Leftwing MEPs crowded into the room to drown out what Le Pen had to say, leading the Parliament's press chief to say that they had behaved "disgracefully". Unfortunately, this abject apology for democracy succeeded: Le Pen secured a total vote in the second round of 18.2%, while Chirac obtained 81.8% – a further lengthy period for him to avoid, under presidential immunity, France's investigating magistrates.

In all, Le Pen's 5.5m voters have placed the nationalist movement in France firmly in the mainstream. Although the recent legislative election results for the FN have been less impressive, two factors should be borne in mind: first, that Le Pen has always scored more heavily than the party of which

RIGHT AROUND THE WORLD

News of patriotic, conservative and regionalist movements across the globe



he is president and, secondly, the FN's 11.2% vote must be judged against the disastrous split in December 1998, following which the FN secured only 5.7% of the popular vote in the European elections. (One consequence of both elections has been the poor showing of Bruno Megret, personally in the presidential race (2.36%) and his party, the Mouvement National Republicain, with 1.14% nationally.) Another possible comfort for disappointed FN supporters is that, as the BBC's William Horsley put it on 5th May 2002: "The support that Mr Le Pen won may well lead the next French government to take a tougher line on crime, immigration and defending French interests in the European Union". It remains to be seen whether Jacques Chirac will avail of his newfound freedom of action to address any of these matters. No doubt, if he does not, the FN will return to dog him.

HOLLAND: The assassination by an animal rights extremist of the Dutch politician, Pim Fortuyn, on 6th May, just before the general election in which his party (List Pim Fortuyn – LPF) had been expected to make substantial gains, shocked many in Holland, a country that prides itself on its easy-going tolerance. Even Leftwing politicians who had been demonising Fortuyn as "the Dutch Mussolini" for wishing to control immigration into Holland were appalled by the indirect consequences of their vitriolic campaign; as one said, Holland had "lost her innocence". Tony Blair cancelled a planned appearance at an anti-Fortuyn Dutch Labour Party rally, when he received news of the shooting.

Fortuyn's distinctive blend of social liberalism and commonsense on immigration struck chords with many

different categories of voter, and his funeral was attended by thousands of mourners, ranging from the outgoing prime minister and a representative of Queen Beatrix, to working-class Dutchmen and women, homosexuals who agreed with Fortuyn's thesis that Third World immigration can endanger liberal values and immigrants who agreed with his belief in greater assimilation.

Fortuyn's name remained at the top of LPF's ballot papers for the 15th May elections. In the event, LPF won 26 out of 150 seats in the Dutch parliament, making it the second-largest party in the parliament, after Jan Peter Balkenende's Christian Democrats (CDA), who won 43 seats. There was much speculation that LPF would go into coalition with CDA and possibly the Liberals (VVD – 23 seats), but internal LPF instability meant that the other parties were not keen. The party's new chairman is Mat Herben, a former Defence Ministry official, whose politics are more conservative than were those of Fortuyn (Herben has described himself as "a Freemason and a good Catholic boy").

PORTUGAL: In March, the Popular Party won 14 seats in the Portuguese parliament, with 8.75% of the vote, and has now become part of a coalition government, under the auspices of the Social Democrat José Manuel Durao Barroso (40.12%). The party is led by Paulo Portas, a well-known Rightwing journalist, and campaigns against corruption, immigration and the transfer of further powers to the EU. It also wants to cut both public spending and corporate taxes. Plans mooted by the defeated Socialist government to liberalise Portugal's laws on drugs and abortion are also now likely to be shelved.

Friends of Right Now!

"Friends of *Right Now!*" recognise the unique position this magazine has come to occupy on the Right, as Britain's most articulate 'politically incorrect' journal. But if *Right Now!* is to become a really effective campaigning force it must be more widely read, especially amongst the 'opinion-formers' within society.

This is where 'Friends of *Right Now!*' can help. By pledging to support the work of the magazine with regular donations they help us to reach an ever-wider audience. If you are interested in becoming a 'Friend', then please write for more information – without any obligation – to:

Right Now!, PO Box 2085, London, W1A 5SX, UK.

A parent of a teenage daughter has written to me asking for help. In brief, his complaint is that three months ago his daughter Lucy, and all other pupils at her school, were set homework of a highly political and controversial nature. It was set out in the form of a competition which postulated and solicited only one "correct" response and was, therefore, an exercise in the political indoctrination of school children.

On making inquiries, her father, a Mr Hancock, discovered that the true originators of the homework leaflet, distributed at the school assembly by the head teacher, was a militant Leftwing organization called Youth Against Racism in Europe. (YARE). The website of these subversives boasts of participation in violent demonstrations and demands the release from prison of the convicted murderer Winston Silcott, a leader of the Tottenham race riot in which PC Keith Blakelock was hacked to death.

A local Sussex organisation, the Anti-Victimisation Initiative (AVI) was used as a front by YARE not only to provide the imprint for the competition leaflet but also to attract support for the project from national and local government agencies, national and local businesses and the Sussex Police for its school homework competition. The AVI was set up to campaign against 'homophobic' attacks on gays in the county and thus managed to establish a working relationship with the police.

Alas, in its desperation to appear politically correct, the Sussex fuzz arranged for police officers to deliver the bulk supplies of the leaflet to Lucy's school and in other schools in the county. The fact that the police have been roped in by the subversive YARE is an outrage. It is also sinister. Is the Home Office completely blind, or has Big Brother of 1984 infamy come true?

As a foreigner who has lived off and on in this country for thirty years, I was delighted to see the English people celebrate the Queen's golden jubilee in the manner they did. Looking around in the world the English concluded that most other systems are much worse. In my own country the presidency is politicised; in France the head of state remains out of jail because he is the head of state, *c'est tout*; in Italy the Prime Minister is more powerful – thank God it's Berlusconi – which means politics reign supreme, pun intended.

No, the British monarchy may have been tarnished by the shenanigans of minor royals, but the hereditary principle of national identity and national unity which it represents is as strong as ever. Never mind what those scummy types of the *Guardian* say. They are envious republicans who would rather see the IRA in Buckingham Palace than the Queen.

The *Guardian* types – ugly, meanspirited and frustrated – think along the lines with



by
Taki

the politicians who are pulling the other way, devaluing, undermining and weakening the sense of identity which every society must have to survive.

Grassroots Britishers know all about Europe – many of the older ones fought for it to stay free. By calling them little Englanders, politicians and the *Guardian* types are insulting those who gave their lives for Britain, democracy and freedom. Shallow politicians have a plan – no ifs or buts about it – to submerge this country into the Eurobureaucrookedness and it's up to all of you out there to do something about it. Civil disobedience should be the first line of defence for freedom.

Racial profiling has an ugly sound to it, ugly only because the politically correct hacks who make up public opinion say so. Here's a little test:

Who at the 1972 Olympics kidnapped and murdered Jewish athletes?

Who took over the US embassy in 1979 in Iran and kept diplomats hostage for 444 days?

During the 1980s who kidnapped British and Americans in Lebanon?

Who blew up the Marine barracks in Beirut in 1983?

Who highjacked the Achille Lauro in 1985?

Ditto the TWA flight 847 in Athens, murdering an American sailor?

In 1988 Pan Am flight 103 was bombed, by whom?

In 1993 the World Trade Centre was partly dynamited, in 1998 the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania were bombed, and of course we all know what took place last September 11. Who did it?

We all know the answers to these questions, but you'd never know it while travelling. On my way over here, on Concorde, American ground security – most of them, in fact all of them either black or

from the sub-continent – searched every blue-eyed mother and their children, and every man who was well-dressed and looked of European descent.

Yet the terrorists are all Muslim males between the ages of 17 and 40. The perpetrators of terror are not the people who are routinely harassed and inconvenienced at our airports, businessmen, women, children and babies. The truth is that ethnic profiling works, and had ethnic profiling been ordered long ago, perhaps 3,000 people would be alive today.

Long before the attack on America, only the terminally naive and politically brainwashed could overlook the evidence of decades. According to that evidence, Arab/Muslim communities provided fertile soil for violence, wanton cruelty, and utter disregard for human life all over the world.

Without doubt, many or most of our Arab and Muslim neighbours intend to be decent, hard-working and law-abiding members of society. Without doubt some tenets of Islam advocate peace and good will to all men of all religions. Yet Islam has a double role in the soul of the believer. Religion is law, and law is religion. Such a posture is simply incompatible with the European model.

Just as I'm about to throw the towel in and give up once and for all on today's youth, it suddenly does something that makes my heart grow fonder, as we romantics like to say. 83 percent of young Britons would like to live abroad and more than half think Britain is a worse place to live now than five years ago.

Of course it's a worse place to live because a bunch of conmen and conwomen have taken over the government – ruling by fiat, bypassing Parliament and using newspapers like the Murdoch press and the *Guardian* and *Independent* to spin its lies. Bill Blair or Tony Clinton will one day go down as the best flim-flam man to ever live at 10 Downing Street. I thought this could only happen in America and in olive republics like Greece. And the papers are even talking about a third term for the conman and that ghastly wife of his.


Well, unlike yours truly, most of Britain's youth cannot live abroad, so they should do something about it. Go and vote out these vermin before they turn Britain into Albania. If they don't, they only have themselves to blame. □

For weekly comment from Taki, see his on-line column on the web-site of the –


NEW YORK PRESS

New York's free weekly newspaper,
at – www.nypress.com

in
**IMPRINT
ACADEMIC**



**EDUCATION &
POLITICS**



The New Idea of a University

Duke Maskell and Ian Robinson

208 pp., £12.95, 0907845 347 (pbk.), May 20 2002

Something has gone deeply wrong with the university — too deeply wrong to be put right by any merely bureaucratic means. What's wrong is, simply, that our official idea of education, the idea that inspires all government policies and 'initiatives', is itself uneducated. With the growing emphasis in higher education on training in supposedly useful skills, has the very ethos of the university been subverted? And does this more utilitarian university succeed in adding to the national wealth, the basis on which politicians justify the large public expenditure on the higher education system? Should we get our idea of a university from politicians and bureaucrats or from J.H. Newman, Jane Austen and Socrates?

The New Idea of a University is an entertaining and highly readable defence of the philosophy of liberal arts education and an attack on the sham that has been substituted for it. It is sure to scandalize all the friends of the present establishment and be cheered elsewhere.

May well become a seminal text in the battle to save quality education. **Anthony Smith, THES**


This wonderful book should make the powers that be stop and think. **Chris Woodhead, Sunday Telegraph**

Blunkett should read this book — but he won't. **Peter Mullen, Spectator**

A severe indictment of the current state of British universities. **Oxford Magazine**

The New Idea of a University is a question we ought to have debated 10 or 15 years ago and still avoid.

John Clare, Daily Telegraph



Education! Education! Education!

Managerial Ethics and the Law of
Unintended Consequences

Edited by Stephen Prickett & Patricia Erskine-Hill


200 pp., £14.95, 0907845 363 (pbk.), July 4 2002

The essays in this book criticise the new positivism in education policy, whereby education is systematically reduced to those things that can be measured by so-called 'objective' tests. School curricula have been narrowed with an emphasis on measurable results in the 3 R's and the 'quality' of university departments is now assessed by managerial exercises based on commercial audit practice. As a result, the traditional notion of liberal arts education has been replaced by utilitarian productivity indices.

Contributors include Libby Purves, Evan Harris, Archbishop Rowan Williams, Roger Scruton, Robert Grant, Bruce Charlton and Anthony Smith.

Stephen Prickett was until recently Regius Professor of English at the University of Glasgow and now teaches at Duke University, in North Carolina, USA. He is a former Chairman of the U.K. Higher Education Foundation, and President of the European Society for the Study of Literature and Theology. He has published one novel and fifteen monographs and edited volumes.

sample chapters, reviews and TOCs: www.imprint-academic.com/education



Universities: The Recovery of an Idea


Gordon Graham

136 pp., £8.95, 0907845 371 (pbk.), July 4 2002

Research assessment exercises, teaching quality assessment, line management, staff appraisal, student course evaluation, modularization, student fees — these are all names of innovations (and problems) — in modern British universities. How far do they reflect a more conscientious approach to the effective promotion of higher education, and how far do they constitute a significant departure from traditional academic concerns and values? Using some themes of Cardinal Newman's classic *The Idea of a University* as a springboard, this extended essay aims to address these questions.

*Those who care about universities should thank Gordon Graham for doing what has needed doing so urgently. **Philosophy***

Gordon Graham is Regius Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Aberdeen and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh.



Dumbing Down: Culture, Politics and the Mass Media

Edited by Ivo Mosley

334 pp., £12.95, 0907845 657 (pbk.)

"Never before in human history has so much cleverness been used to such stupid ends. The cleverness is in the creation and manipulation of markets, media and power; the stupid ends are in the destruction of community, responsibility, morality, art, religion and the natural world." (Introduction. p.1).

The essays are divided into **Government:** *Tam Dalyell, Ivo Mosley, Michael Oakeshott, Redmond Mullin, Michael Johnson, Dominic Hobson; Culture:* *Ravi Shankar, Philip Rieff, Robert Brustein, Anne Glynn, Roger Deakin, Mark Ryan; Media:* *Adam Boulton, Oliver O'Donovan; Art:* *Laura Gascoigne, David Lee, Peter Randall-Page, Bill Hare; Education:* *Michael Polanyi, Claire Fox, Andrew Williams; Science:* *Joan Leach, John Ziman, Jaron Lanier, Walter Freeman; Religion:* *Helen Oppenheimer, Nicholas Mosley; The Environment:* *C.D. Darlington, Demelza Spargo.*

*If there is hope at all, it lies in the existence of books like this. **Geoffrey Wheatcroft, Daily Mail***

*At last we have a map of the moronic inferno. **Laurence Coupe, PN Review***

*Serious essays by known and established writers. **George Wedd, Contemporary Review***


*The lively intelligence of the essays cannot be dismissed. **Chris Woodhead, Sunday Telegraph***

*Page after page of wise insights and acerbic observations. **Derek Turner, Chronicles***

*The editor has certainly rounded up quite an impressive list. **Robert McCrum, Observer***

*An entertaining and informative read, well worth £12.95. **Septimus Waugh, Literary Review***

sample chapters, reviews and TOCs: www.imprint-academic.com/education



Holding Up A Mirror: How Civilizations Decline

Anne Glyn-Jones

652 pp., £14.95, 0907845 606 (pbk.)

According to Glyn-Jones, the central dilemma of history is this: the dynamic that promotes economic prosperity leads inexorably to the destruction of the very security and artistic achievement on which civilizations rest their claim. This book argues that the growth of prosperity is driven largely by the conviction that the material world alone constitutes true 'reality'. Yet that same dynamic—developing a critique of all belief in the supernatural as at best superfluous, and at worst a damaging superstition—undermines the authority of moral standards and leads to social and cultural disintegration.

Focussing on dramatic entertainment as the barometer of social change, the author shows in vivid detail how the thesis worked itself out in four different civilizations: those of Greece, Rome, medieval Christendom, and now in our own contemporary society.

This is a visionary book. Painful yet true in its portrait of the present, it is clearly driven by the anxieties of a sensitive and conscientious observer. **Bryan Appleyard, Sunday Times**

Those who share Anne Glyn-Jones's belief in objective values will congratulate her on a thoroughly researched and illuminating reinterpretation of what Sorokin saw as 'The Crisis of Our Age'.


Angela Ellis-Jones, Times Literary Supplement

It is a strength of this rich and engrossing book that it provokes on almost every page a willingness to argue with the author. Her thesis is challenging, and her examples abundantly interesting.

Alan Massie, Daily Telegraph

Glyn-Jones' intriguing book puts an entirely new gloss on the stereotyped picture of fanatical Islamic theocracy. **Frank McLynn, New Statesman and Society**

Her focus on the theatre . . . gives her book an interest and a solid core that lend credibility to the main thesis. **John Habgood, THES**



Philosophy and Living

Ralph Blumenau


626 pp., £19.95, 0907845 339 (pbk.), 2 September 2002

Philosophy can be very abstract and apparently remote from our everyday concerns. In this book Ralph Blumenau brings out for the non-specialist the bearing that thinkers of the past have on the way we live now, on the attitude we have towards our lives, towards each other and our society, towards God and towards the ethical problems that confront us.

Ralph Blumenau was Head of the History Department at Malvern College. Since his retirement in 1985 he has been teaching senior citizens at the University of the Third Age in London, where one of his courses is the History of Philosophy.

Democracy Direct

politics in the
post-parliamentary age



Mike Diboll

Democracy Direct

Mike Diboll

104 pp., £8.95, 0907845169 (pbk.), 2 September 2002

This work argues that Britain is no longer a parliamentary democracy. The book charts the gradual erosion of the sovereignty of parliament since 1945, the marginalization of the role of the cabinet, the rise of the centrally organized and controlled mass-membership party and the increasingly presidential role of the prime minister in the Thatcher and Blair governments. This background, together with the British constitution's system of 'elective dictatorship', underpins the decline of both parliament and of the representative principle in contemporary Britain. In parallel to the decline of representative democracy, the book also examines the importing into British politics of devices derived from


advertising and marketing such as focus groups, government by plebiscite and the rise of social authoritarianism and populism on the UK political scene.

The Rape of the Constitution?

Edited by Keith Sutherland

Foreword by Michael Beloff QC

384 pp., £12.95, 0907845 703 (pbk.)



Lord Hailsham once remarked that if you removed a brick from the wall of the British constitution, the building was likely to collapse; yet Tony Blair has embarked on a reckless and unprecedented path of constitutional change. Has the steady increase in executive power turned Bagehot's 'disguised republic' into an elective dictatorship?

Such important and swiftly executed change deserves proper detailed analysis. It gets just that in this wide-ranging and intelligent volume, and from such distinguished names as Gillian Peele, Simon Jenkins, Roy Jenkins, Tony Benn and Bernard Weatherill. **TLS**

Raises many interesting and important questions. **John Dunn, THES**

To be read and enjoyed by all who love freedom and democracy and mistrust the aspirations of the state.

Chris Woodhead, Sunday Telegraph

The contributors do not all trot out their views in a strict party line, but appear to be honest in their assessments. **Stewart Myhan, Freedom Today**

This book is a forum in which all aspects of the debate are examined — with essays from scholars, politicians and journalists from across the political spectrum. **Jon Temple, Republic**

A collection of thoughtful and thought-provoking essays by some of the best known politicians, journalists and academics in contemporary Britain. **The Commonwealth Lawyer**

This book is a call to wake up. **George Wedd, Contemporary Review**

This book could scarcely be more timely or more needed. **John Humphrys**

Incremental totalitarianism! Such partisan exaggeration defames the memory of the dead. **Bernard Crick**

Reform cannot be equated with rape without a degree of terminological inexactitude. **Vernon Bogdanor**

I only wonder if you need that question mark in the title. **Margaret Thatcher**

sample chapters, reviews and TOCs: www.imprint-academic.com/politics

BRITISH IDEALIST STUDIES

Imprint Academic is pleased to announce a new monograph series reflecting the renewed interest in the British idealists. For the most part comprising revised and updated PhD theses, all texts will undergo a rigorous review process and conventional copy editing.



Series 1: Oakeshott

Editor: Noël O'Sullivan, University of Hull

Editorial Board: Wendell John Coats Jr., Richard Flathman, Paul Franco, Robert Grant, John Gray, John Kekes, Kenneth Minogue, Terry Nardin, Lord Parekh and Patrick Riley.


Forthcoming series titles:

Andrew Sullivan, *Intimations Pursued: The Voice of Practice in the Conversation of Michael Oakeshott*

Roy Tseng, *The Sceptical Idealist:*

Michael Oakeshott as a Critic of the Enlightenment

Luke O'Sullivan, *Oakeshott on History*



Series 2: Collingwood

Editor: David Boucher, Cardiff University

Editorial Board: W.H. Dray, Gary Browning, Bruce Haddock, Rex Martin, Guido Vanheeswijck and Jan van der Dussen.

Forthcoming series titles:


James Connelly, *Metaphysics, Method and Politics: The Political Philosophy of R.G. Collingwood*

Stein Helgeby, *Action as History:*

The Historical Thought of R.G. Collingwood

Marnie Hughes-Warrington, *'How Good an Historian Shall I be?': R.G. Collingwood, The Historical Imagination*

and Education



Series 3: Green


Editor: Peter Nicholson, University of York

Editorial Board: G.F. Gaus, John Morrow, Lord Plant, Avital Simhony, Geoffrey Thomas and Andrew Vincent.

Forthcoming series titles:

Matt Carter, *T.H. Green and the Development of Ethical Socialism*

Ben Wempe, *Beyond Equality: A Study of T.H. Green's Theory of Positive Freedom*



The State of the Nations 2001: The Second Year of Devolution in the United Kingdom

Edited by Alan Trench
Senior Research Fellow, Constitution Unit, UCL

304 pp., £14.95, 0907845193 (pbk.)

The chapters in this book cover the second year of devolution in the UK, bringing together the fruits of a major five-year research programme funded by the Leverhulme Trust. The programme comprises 11 research projects, underpinned by a regular series of monitoring reports, written by teams of experts in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. This book is an essential text for courses in constitutional law/UK politics.

Another highly detailed and useful contribution to the study of the UK's devolution process.

Rosanne Palmer, Regional and Federal Studies

'The State and the Nations' is part of a considered and authoritative long-term academic study of the constitutional reform of this country. **John Reid, The Scotsman**

Admirably lucid and comprehensive. **Scottish Affairs**

Packed full of useful information . . . the price asked is modest for so authoritative and useful a publication.

Howard Elcock, Representation

The most scholarly and up to date commentary on the UK devolution experience presently available.

Roger Guthrie, Lecturer in Territorial Politics, University of Newcastle

An invaluable volume of record for all serious students of the changing UK. **Vernon Bogdanor**

ORDER FORM

Name

Address *

* Credit card customers must supply cardholder registered address

Home telephone number E-mail

Please send the following books (postage and packing free of charge): Price


.
.
.
.

☐ £ cheque enclosed (drawn on UK bank), made payable to 'Imprint Academic'.

☐ Visa ☐ MC ☐ Amex ☐ Switch ☐ Delta. Card Number


Expiry Date . . Issue number (Switch) Signature

IMPRINT ACADEMIC, PO Box 1, Thorverton, EX5 5YX, UK
Tel: 01392 841600 Fax: 01392 841478 Email: sandra@imprint.co.uk





'The papers are without exception excellent'
Biology and Philosophy

'The publication is very timely indeed. It is a splendid initiative'
Times Literary Supplement




'Presents readers with a myriad of important issues' *T.I.C.S.*





Interdisciplinary studies of religious experience

'Consistently erudite'
Contemporary Psychology




'The best concerted effort to date from the philosophers' camp'
Times Higher Educational Supplement




'A penetrating neurological theory'
Science

'The collection is wide-ranging in its scope'
Times Literary Supplement



'A notable collection of essays'
Antonio Damasio



Interdisciplinary perspectives on determinism

Second-person approaches to the study of consciousness

